

9222. By Mr. CONDON: Petition of Louis Cabana and 202 other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against any repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9223. Also, petition of Raymond A. Kern and 92 other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against any repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9224. Also, petition of Eugene Lemoi and 201 other citizens of Rhode Island, protesting against the repeal or modification of existing legislation beneficial to Spanish War veterans, their widows, or dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9225. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Hudson Detachment, of Jersey City; Captain Burwell H. Clarke Detachment, of Newark; and the Bergen County Detachment, of Hackensack, State of New Jersey; and the New York Detachment, No. 1, in joint conference assembled in Brooklyn, N. Y., on December 12, 1932, strenuously opposing the attempt on the part of Congress to further reduce the personnel of the United States Marine Corps, in that such reduction will completely disrupt the efficiency of the corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9226. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Ladies' Society of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Enid, Okla., indorsing House bill 10023, providing for retirement insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9227. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers at their Southwestern Union meeting on October 27, 1932, urging sufficient appropriation to maintain standard bureau of locomotive inspection safety and appliances and hours of service that they may be maintained at their full capacity and held intact in their entirety; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9228. Also, petition urging enactment of railroad pension bills, H. R. 9891 and S. 4646; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9229. Also, petition urging support of the railroad pension bills, H. R. 9891 and S. 4646; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9230. By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Petition of J. A. Cunningham and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the stop-alien amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9231. Also, petition of Rev. Clarence C. Watson and other residents of Cortland County, N. Y., favoring the stop-alien amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9232. By Mr. HARLAN: Petition of Howard H. Mann and a number of other residents of Dayton, Ohio, favoring inflated currency being distributed by earning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9233. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of residents of Coldwater, Mich., favoring passage of stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9234. By Mr. PARSONS: Petition of Louie J. Gaskins and other citizens of Saline County, Ill., urging an increase in the purchasing power of the masses as a means to break the depression and restore prosperity; to the Committee on Labor.

9235. By Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri: Petition concerning the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9236. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Telegrams from Claude C. Wild, of the Independent Petroleum Association of Texas, and Danciger Oil & Refining Co. of Texas, Fort Worth, Tex., opposing House bill 12076; to the Committee on Rules.

9237. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of McKeesport, Pa., favoring the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9238. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Mrs. S. J. Fickel, president, and Mrs. Harry Sammons, secretary, Woman's

Home Missionary Society, Westerville, Ohio, petitioning Congress to enact a law which will establish a Federal motion-picture commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9239. By Mr. MILLARD: Resolution presented by request and passed by the Alan F. Waite Post, No. 299, of the American Legion, Yonkers, N. Y., indicating that 93 per cent of its members are opposed to the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9240. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition signed by 603 citizens of Marceline, Mo., protesting against the modification of the Volstead Act or the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9241. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of 42 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any measures providing for the manufacture of beer or the nullification of the Constitution, and against any proposal to repeal the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9242. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of Donnie Warnock and 29 other citizens of Stilson, Ga., deploring vote against repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9243. By Mr. SPARKS: Resolution of banks of Logan-Wallace County Bankers Association of Kansas and customers of those banks, submitted by the First National Bank of Oakley, Kans., and signed by 21 banks and 280 customers of those banks belonging to the Logan-Wallace County Bankers Association of Kansas, favoring the repeal of the portion of the revenue act pertaining to the 2-cent tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9244. By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Junction City, presented by Robert M. Hay, president of the Civic Service Club of Geary County, and Mrs. Robert M. Hay, president of the B. S. S. of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Junction City, all of the State of Kansas, favoring passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution to count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Clifford H. Joep, pastor of the Ninth Street Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Divine Father, we thank Thee for the privileges of a new start. As this week closes its grave walls over the journey and experiences of the past year, we shall lay all our mistakes and all our heartaches at the door like a shabby old coat, never to be put on again. We shall not leave off those finer and nobler traits which partake of Thyself, O God, and which have made this Nation great, but our regrets and failures shall not enter the land of beginning again.

Through all the days of our life, Father, glorify Thyself in us as Thou art transforming the rain into roses.

May Thy spirit rule in this Chamber to-day and Thy divine favor rest upon all service rendered the people of the United States.

In the spirit of our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 22, 1932.

The Hon. JOHN NANCE GARNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I transmit herewith pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress approved on May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 945), copies of the certificates of final ascertainment of electors for President and

Vice President of the United States appointed on November 8, 1932, in the States which are indicated below.

Very truly yours,

H. L. STIMSON.

(Inclosure:) Certificates furnished by the Governors of the States of Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Authenticated photostat copies of certificates furnished by the Governors of the States of Indiana, Oregon, and Texas.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill H. R. 7233, an act to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire when it is the intention of the majority to take up this report?

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] can probably answer that.

Mr. HARE. So far as we are concerned, I think the plan is to take up the report to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT OVER NEW YEAR'S

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, is it the plan to adjourn from Friday to Tuesday next, as we did last week?

Mr. RAINEY. We will be able to announce that to-morrow. We will see how we get along with this bill. The deficiency bill be the next one to be taken up, and it is not yet ready. It is hoped it will be ready by the time we get through with the agriculture bill.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman intend to take up the deficiency bill this week?

Mr. RAINEY. It might be possible to take it up Saturday for general debate with the understanding there will be nothing but general debate, and then it might be possible to adjourn over to next Tuesday so the Members could go home if they wanted to and get back by Tuesday. We will be able to make a definite announcement about this to-morrow, but I think that will be the program.

SALES TAX

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman make any definite announcement at this time with regard to the Ways and Means Committee's considering the sales tax?

Mr. RAINEY. No; I can not make any announcement. The Ways and Means Committee will meet on the 3d.

Mr. SNELL. I understood from the papers yesterday morning that the Speaker stated there would be a sales tax. This morning he is carried as stating there will not be a sales tax. Can the gentleman give us any definite information in regard to the matter?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

SEED LOANS

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit an inquiry to our distinguished majority leader. The Senate has passed a bill providing for seed loans to farmers. Last year and the year before these seed loans to farmers were not provided for until along in March. Thousands and thousands of farmers could not get the seed loans because enough blanks were not distributed. They said, "You sent us hundreds when we asked for thousands." Can we not take this bill up and pass it at an early date in order that we may get these loans to the farmers? Many people in Texas, Arkansas, and the Southern States will soon be making preparations for their planting.

Mr. RAINEY. I will say to the gentleman we will try to do that. I am impressed by what the gentleman says; and if I can accomplish it, we will take it up at an early date.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13872) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13872, with Mr. MONTAGUE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and matings; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising and press clippings, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings and heating apparatus; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of not to exceed three (including one for the Secretary of Agriculture, one for general utility needs of the entire department, and one for the Forest Service) and purchase and exchange of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle and one motor cycle for official purposes only; for the payment of the Department of Agriculture's proportionate share of the expense of the dispatch agent in New York; for official traveling expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field for any bureau, office, or service of the department; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the department, which are authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate, \$267,254: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1934 may maintain stocks of stationery, supplies, equipment, and miscellaneous materials sufficient to meet, in whole or in part, requirements of the bureaus and offices of the department in the city of Washington and elsewhere, but not to exceed in the aggregate \$200,000 in value at the close of the fiscal year, and the appropriations made for such bureaus and offices for such stocks and for toilet-room supplies and materials and equipment used to clean, in whole or in part, the buildings occupied by the department in the city of Washington shall be available to reimburse the appropriation for miscellaneous expenses current at the time supplies are issued: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made hereunder shall be available for the payment of salaries of employees engaged in purchasing, storing, handling, packing, or shipping of supplies and blank forms and the amount of such salaries shall be charged proportionately as a part of the cost of supplies issued and in the case of blank forms and supplies not purchased from this appropriation the amount of such salaries shall be charged proportionately to the proper appropriation: *Provided further*, That the facilities of the central storehouse of the department shall to the fullest extent practicable be used to make unnecessary the maintenance of separate bureau storehouse activities in the department: *Provided further*, That a separate schedule of expenditures, transfers of funds, or other transactions hereunder shall be included in the annual Budget.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that moving into this new wing of the Department of Agriculture building increases the appropriation under this paragraph \$77,000. I am wondering if there is any saving in rent that would at all compare with this increase in operating expenses.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. What is the necessity for this extra expenditure? Is it to take care of the heating of the wing, and so forth?

Mr. TABER. The heating, the equipment, and all that sort of thing. It is just the usual rule that when you build a lot of new buildings you have to pay out a lot more money than you did before for the operation of the department.

Mr. PARSONS. Is it expected that this item will stay at this amount and that this extra \$77,000 will be needed year after year in the future?

Mr. TABER. I am not on the subcommittee and can not answer that question, but I would say that is the general rule.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It will not be necessary each year. A part of it will be necessary, such as the amount necessary to run the elevators and to take care of similar operating expenses. The major part of this item, however, is to equip the wing that will be completed before the fiscal year is out, and the figures are based on exactly what it cost to equip the wing that they now occupy. Only a part of the appropriation will be permanent, and that will be for the hire of elevator operators and expenses of that kind.

Mr. PARSONS. While we are on this subject, if the gentleman will permit, there has been considerable new building for the Department of Agriculture during the last five or six years, as I understand. How do the extra expenses compare with the rents before this new building was done?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The rent item for 1930 was over \$200,000, and for this year it is \$45,000. This indicates how the item is decreasing as we occupy the new building.

Mr. PARSONS. And for the next year there is an extra expense of \$77,000 because of the building of a new wing?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. That will mean a net saving of about \$25,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And the other item is reduced \$25,000. The Clerk read as follows:

For all printing and binding for the Department of Agriculture, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, \$850,000, including the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, as required by the act approved January 12, 1895 (U. S. C., title 44, sec. 111, title 7, secs. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), March 16, Joint Resolution No. 13, approved March 30, 1906 (U. S. C., title 44, secs. 214, 224), and also including not to exceed \$250,000 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants of the Weather Bureau and the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, in accordance with the act approved March 1, 1919 (U. S. C., title 44, secs. 111, 220).

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: On page 7, line 18, strike out "\$850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$610,000."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 51 of the hearings you will notice that the Bureau of the Budget put a limitation of \$665,000 on printing and binding work for the department. The total amount, \$900,000, for 1934 is \$240,000 more than we will spend during the current year. This \$240,000, which is the amount of the reduction under the proposed amendment, therefore, will not be needed this year. It is a sort of hang-over from years before with a large amount of printed matter available for the Members, and I respectfully refer you to page 57 of the hearings, where they have reduced the allotment of bulletins for the Members from 20,000 per Member to 5,000 per Member, and then it is stated on the next page:

The distribution to date indicates that the congressional distribution for the year will be about 7,000,000 to 8,000,000 copies; of this total, 2,665,000 copies will probably come from the new allotments and the balance from the accrued quotas.

By a reduction of \$240,000 we can, in the first place, make a real saving and really not hamper in any way the work of the department.

At the bottom of page 58 the hearings state:

Sometimes a Member's accrued quota will climb as high as 200,000, which means, obviously, that he has accumulated at least a 10 to 12 years' supply.

Then we go over to page 63 and we find they have developed a new program as a suggestion, and I am going to read this:

Under this plan post offices would sell printed, self-addressed cards valid only for the purchase of Government publications from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. On one side would be printed a form of application. The farmer or the business man or anyone who wished to obtain a bulletin would need only to sign his name and address and give the title of the publication. A blue card, let us say, would sell for 5 cents, a red card for 10 cents, a green card for 15 cents, and so on up to 25 cents. The purchaser's part would be greatly facilitated.

Mr. Chairman, this program as outlined in the hearings indicates there would be a considerable shrinkage from the postal receipts if this particular program should ever go into effect, and I understand it is the desire of the committee to have this program go into effect as soon as it may be conveniently arranged. So I contend that if this amendment were passed it would not in any way hamper the Department of Agriculture, but would simply cut down on this large allotment, which sometimes includes an accumulation of 10 or 12 years.

For this reason I hope the committee will see fit to make this cut in the appropriation at this place.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is mistaken in his assumption that Members of Congress have ten or twelve thousand copies of bulletins on hand. There are Members of Congress who have not used their supply, and they have a book credit of as much as 200,000, but it is only a book credit.

The bulletins are not printed. They have never been printed, and probably many of them will never be printed unless these Members call on the department to furnish them. There are only 2,000,000 bulletins for distribution. They will be exhausted in a few months.

The drastic cut in the printing bill last year was caused by the economy act. They cut the yearly appropriation to a large amount to balance the Budget, with the result that in cutting the appropriation the department could not keep up with the necessary printing.

Thereafter the Budget fixed the appropriation at \$900,000, and the committee reduced it \$50,000. Some think we made a mistake in reducing it at all. This committee reduced it \$50,000 to economize, but as a matter of fact the printing department is far behind. Many scientific papers, the result of scientific investigation, are laid on the shelf and not published at all. So this money is necessary for the department to perpetuate, diffuse, and distribute the information that has been gathered by scientific research.

Mr. GOSS. On page 59 of the hearings Mr. Eisenhower says:

except when we find ourselves in a position such as we face this year. We are compelled to make drastic reductions. At the same time we are in the embarrassing position of owing Members of Congress 25,000,000 publications and are not able to supply even half of them.

You have reduced the allotment from 25,000 to 5,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. When the Budget determined to reduce the amount allowed for printing they first determined that they would not allow Members of Congress any more, but they found that 20 per cent had exhausted their entire allotment and that it would not be right to deprive them of all bulletins. Therefore, they allowed 5,000 to each Member instead of 20,000. But it is possible to increase this from 5,000 to 12,000.

Mr. GOSS. Well, we got along pretty well last year, and now the gentleman says that they can be increased to 12,000. According to my observation, we had plenty last year.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is it not possible to put in a provision saying that no part of the appropriation shall be available to print the bulletins of the past?

Mr. GOSS. That would save a large amount.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As a matter of fact it evens itself up. Last year I exhausted my bulletins and went to a colleague from the city of New York and he gave me 25,000 bulletins. I used them and sent them out to my constituents. So other Members of Congress living in agricultural districts can go to colleagues in the city and procure additional bulletins. As I say, it evens itself up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Goss) there were 19 ayes and 38 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I refer to page 7, line 10, under the subhead "Salaries and general expenses." I find there the language, "Purchase of manuscripts." An appropriation is made in that paragraph, part of which may be used for the purpose of purchasing manuscripts. What manuscripts does the Department of Agriculture purchase; and if it is making its own scientific developments, why purchase any manuscripts?

Mr. BUCHANAN. To be frank with the gentleman, I do not think they are purchasing any manuscripts; but that is just some old language carried over from some time in the past.

Mr. PARSONS. I know that sometimes these gentlemen connected with the colleges and universities have a happy thought about some scientific question and write a treatise upon it, and perhaps they sell it to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have known of instances also where they procured the services of a college professor and paid part of his expenses for making investigation and research along a certain line in which he was a specialist. That is why that language is in there.

Mr. PARSONS. I should think the committee should know about how much of this fund is expended for that purpose; and if we have our own investigators and scientific men, my opinion is that the fund should be paid to them and that we should not purchase outside manuscripts.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not think they are being purchased, but I shall investigate the matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1887 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 362, 363, 365, 368, 377-379), entitled "An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 301-308), and of the acts supplementary thereto," the sums apportioned to the several States to be paid quarterly in advance, \$720,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice that in all of these experimental items there are absolutely no cuts, notwithstanding the fact that a large portion of this expenditure must be for labor and salaries, where those things have taken effect as the result of the economy bill. Is it not possible to cut these items under experimental stations at least the $8\frac{1}{3}$ per cent, so that the Government might take advantage of that situation? I can not find anything in the hearings that would bear on this question, but it seems to me that we ought to do this, and that this appropriation ought to carry as much cut as the other items. I would be glad to yield to the chairman to answer that question.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, it is not possible to cut the salaries under these appropriations, and that is owing to the legislative action of Congress. These appropriations are turned over to the States and expended by the States. The only control the Federal Government has over them is a supervisory control, to see that a proper, coordinated program of research is carried out in the States, and that one State does not duplicate the research of another. There is a total sum of \$90,000, absolutely turned over to each State for an endowment of the agriculture or land-grant colleges of the United States. Every State in the Union gets it, and they have been getting it for some years. It has gradually increased, by virtue, first, of the Hatch Act, the Adams Act, and the Purnell Act, granting a certain amount to each State, and the amount does not even have to be matched by the States. It is simply a donation in the interest of agriculture and agricultural research, and the Federal Government has no power over its salaries, except it might not want to approve the program of a State that was paying out too much in salaries.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think that something ought to be done to put this establishment on somewhat the same basis that other establishments that are supported by the Government are on?

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the gentleman is asking my opinion, I say that I think the Congress ought to rewrite the entire experimental or endowment system extension service of this country and put it into one bill and not have it in half a dozen. It should be divided among the States under one rule. Confusion is caused in the administration, and we ought to rewrite the whole business.

Mr. TABER. And also duplication is caused. Is not that right?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; they do not have any duplication, because it is the province of the Federal Government to see that these different experimental stations do not investigate the same subjects. There were 1,800 different scien-

tific or near-scientific questions investigated or under investigation, and the Federal Government sees to it that no two colleges investigate the same subject.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee on Agriculture and also the subcommittee on agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations will investigate this proposition carefully, with the idea of seeing if some saving can not be made along the line of better organization and more efficient work, and the placing of this establishment on the same basis that other departments of the Government are on, so that some part at least of the four and a half million dollars which is expended on this subject can be saved in the future.

The Clerk read as follows:

To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 16, 1906 (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 369), entitled "An act to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations and regulating the expenditure thereof," and acts supplementary thereto, the sums apportioned to the several States to be paid quarterly in advance, \$720,000.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: Page 9, line 18, insert "Provided, That no expenditure shall be made hereunder until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations, for the accomplishment of such purposes."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, on that I raise the point of order.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment in view of the language that I find in the hearings to the effect that the item of \$90,000 paid each State and appropriations to the three Territories is not matched by the States—

There is no matching requirement. Under the terms of the act, however, it is intended that there would be participation, the State furnishing at least the physical plant.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that that is simply cutting down the share of the Federal Government in that type of work whereby the States were intended at least to put forth some of the funds.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The States actually furnished more than their portion. That is, they matched, by 3 to 1, the Federal appropriation.

Mr. GOSS. We are spending on this particular experiment station about \$25,000,000 per year, are we not, including the permanent appropriation, which amounts to over \$4,500,000?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Federal Government is not expending that amount; no.

Mr. GOSS. I understand there is carried as a permanent appropriation for this item alone, \$4,600,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is correct.

Mr. GOSS. And then we are appropriating \$2,800,000 and so on down the line—\$4,381,000 in all here—and the hearings on page 91 indicate that about \$25,000,000 is being expended by the Federal Government. It reads:

Federal funds expended for cooperative agricultural extension work—

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, the gentleman is talking about extension work now.

Mr. GOSS. But this is part of it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, no.

Mr. GOSS. It is an experiment station?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No.

Mr. GOSS. Well, I am sorry if I am wrong; but the other part is not wrong, I am sure, with reference to the intention of having the States supply funds to this experiment office.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman understands that an experiment station and extension service are two different services?

Mr. GOSS. That is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a point of order pending. I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and it is an attempt to control a fund that Congress has no right to control, because it is absolutely donated by the Government to the States.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MONTAGUE). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair sustains the point of order. It is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to call attention to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss], for the reason that I feel Congress heretofore, in an effort to assist agriculture, has placed, directly or indirectly, a burden upon the States they are now unable to carry. In other words, the Hatch Act, the Morrill Act, the Adams Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, the Smith-Lever Act, and a number of other acts of Congress were designed primarily to aid agriculture by furnishing scientific information in connection with agriculture, but most of the proposals were made to the States conditionally. Appropriations were made and offered to the States upon condition that they match the funds offered. The Federal Government has been more able to supply its proportion of the funds than the individual States, and in these times of depression we find that many of the States, in an effort to carry on this work, are assuming obligations that are impossible for them to meet. That is, the Federal Government in an effort to promote scientific agriculture is placing a burden on the States greater than they are able to carry. I think the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss] is sincere in offering his amendment. The amendment is logical, based upon other legislation, but I feel it would simply be an additional burden upon the States if the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. GARBER. Would not the curtailment of funds advanced, to be matched by the States, break the continuity of the educational institutions that we have expended millions in setting up?

Mr. HARE. I agree with you. That is absolutely correct. It would break the continuity, but I do not think that the injury or damage sustained as a result of this breach would be as great as the injury or damage sustained in trying to maintain a standard we are financially unable to maintain. In other words, those engaged in agriculture are so depressed that the continuity of their standard of living and their standard of life to-day is broken. The continuity, so to speak, is broken to such an extent that it will take them years and years to get back to that standard they enjoyed a few years ago. I am wondering whether it would not be better to break the continuity in their scientific training in order that they might restore that standard of life and that standard of living they deserve to maintain in their everyday life. In other words, if I represented the entire agricultural interests of this country as an individual I would much rather have the continuity of my esthetic life broken than to have the continuity of my bread-and-butter life broken for a period of years.

Mr. GARBER. At least the gentleman will admit that any withdrawal should be accompanied with great care and should be gradually diminished?

Mr. HARE. Yes; I understand that, and I am very much in sympathy with the idea the gentleman is advancing, but this is a critical time, this is a critical situation, and to impose greater burdens upon the States by the proposed amendment, in my opinion, would not be justified. As a matter of fact, I favor the reduction of some of the appropriations now being made by the Federal Government and offered to the States on condition that they match these funds, for it would enable some States now groaning under the burden of taxation to reduce their appropriations so that their expenditures and revenues may meet and insure a balanced budget.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I think what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] has said bears directly upon what I said early in the discussion of this paragraph. We are requiring tremendous expenditures for experimentation and for all that sort of thing, and appropriations by the States to match them if they go on. We have a situation where the taxpayers' interest in this country demands that things be cut down. I appreciate it is almost impossible on the floor of the House, in considering this bill, to draw amendments which will meet this situation and cut down the expenditures of the Government and cut down the expenditures of the States, but I believe it ought to be done. I believe that the Committee on Agriculture ought to consider this immediately and ought to bring in a bill which will not only cut down the States' contribution for this sort of thing but the Federal Government's contribution, so that we may be able to save something, and that work can be conducted on the basis of current costs rather than at costs prevailing 10 years ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

To carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to authorize the more complete endowment of agricultural experiment stations," approved February 24, 1925 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 361, 366, 370, 371, 373-376, 380, 382), \$2,880,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. On page 9, at lines 20 and 21, the language occurs:

An act to authorize the more complete endowment of agricultural experiment stations.

I understand that \$90,000 annually are set aside for the purpose of the endowment of these stations. Am I correct?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARE. The question I want to ask is this: Is \$90,000 kept in the Treasury, as we often think of endowments being kept in an institution, or is this sum spent annually and no endowment accumulated?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is turned over to the States.

Mr. HARE. And the money is spent.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is turned over to the States. First, it is allotted by States, and the States make their programs. A State makes its program and sends it to the Agricultural Department or to the Secretary. If he approves it, then he sends the allotment to the State, and the State spends it, and he checks up to see whether or not the State carried into effect that program and paid out the money as required.

Mr. HARE. Then, in reality, the experimental stations do not get a complete endowment. Is that the fact?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the fact. I know of nothing complete in this world.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations, \$4,381,000.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: Page 10, line 17, strike out the figure "4" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "3" so that the total amount will read "\$3,381,000."

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to the repeated newspaper articles in recent days, quoting officials of the House and of the Senate with reference to the necessity for reducing the expenses of government and also the necessity of imposing some more taxes in event cost of government shall not be reduced.

I am in favor of reducing the expenses of the Government. I have voted to reduce my own little salary and have voted to reduce it more than it has been reduced. I believe the only way to reduce is to reduce. This is my only object in offering this amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, if this item were reduced \$1,000,000, it would upset the program as mapped out for every agricultural college in every State of the Union for

research work, investigation, and farm demonstration, and the whole agricultural program of our land.

If it is desired to decrease these appropriations we give the States by a large amount, let the agricultural legislative committee do the work and bring in a bill changing the authorization acts so that the States will have some notice of what is coming and so that the whole program will not be upset with resulting confusion and chaos.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Texas I will say that his position is well taken. Quite naturally a material reduction in any of these appropriations now before us will upset the plans and arrangements for those in charge of the expenditure of the anticipated appropriations. There is no question about that, but we must begin somewhere, and the only way to reduce the cost of government is to reduce the appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOWARD) there were—ayes 18, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For cooperative agricultural extension work, to be allotted, paid, and expended in the same manner, upon the same terms and conditions, and under the same supervision as the additional appropriations made by the act of May 8, 1914 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 341-348), entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 301-308), and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," \$1,580,000; and all sums appropriated by this act for use for demonstration or extension work within any State shall be used and expended in accordance with plans mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in such State which receives the benefits of said act of May 8, 1914: *Provided*, That of the above appropriation not more than \$300,000 shall be expended for purpose other than salaries of county agents.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order on the paragraph for the moment, and in the meantime I wish to move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to press his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I wish to reserve the point of order, if I may, and in the meantime I want to move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can reserve the point of order or move to strike out the last word, but he can not do both.

Mr. TABER. Then I will ask the question under a reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I find from the hearings that there are a large number of counties and units throughout the country that are unable longer to appropriate the amount of money that has been required by the statute in order to enable them to participate in this extension work, that a number have been dropped, and that a large number probably will be dropped. I wonder if the gentleman could not tell us some amount that we might be able to save on this extension work that could be saved along this line in this appropriation? It seems that we are going along without substantial reductions in this item, and that we ought at this time to make reductions which the head of the department has indicated could be made.

How much does the gentleman think we ought to save along this line, or how much could be saved along this line?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman's question is, How much could we save?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We could save the whole business if we did not appropriate it.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but how much could we save by virtue of those units which will not be able to comply with the statutory requirements to entitle them to receive this aid?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is speaking of county agents and home-economics agents?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. According to the hearings, we can not save anything.

Mr. TABER. But the hearings indicated that there were numbers dropping out, and I know of my own knowledge of some places where that is true.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will read the gentleman what Mr. Warburton says in his testimony before the subcommittee:

So far as I know, I think all the States can meet their usual allotments of funds to the counties, to all counties which are now making appropriations. The tendency has been in the last year or more for an occasional county to cut off appropriations, and not very many new ones are coming in under the present circumstances.

So it is about holding its own. Heretofore the applications for county agents and home-economics agents have always been more than could be supplied. It is important to maintain this work on such a basis that if we help pay the salary of county and home-economics agents for one county we can provide for the other counties which desire these agents. According to the department, approximately the same number of counties will request and receive the same number of agents.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph on the ground that it is a delegation of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture which is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York kindly specify the particular language?

Mr. TABER. The language is at the bottom of page 12, in line 25, which reads as follows:

And all sums appropriated by this act for use for demonstration or extension work within any State shall be used and expended in accordance with plans mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in such State which receives the benefits of said act of May 8, 1914.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Assuming that language is stricken out, will the gentleman exercise any economy? Does the gentleman intend to strike out the whole paragraph?

Mr. TABER. That was the idea.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then permit me to warn the gentleman that it may be introduced with the objectionable matter omitted, and we will then have the appropriation without this saving clause. Conceding that the limitation is legislation, at least it is conducive to an economical and orderly arrangement between the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the colleges. I have no interest in the matter, as the gentleman knows, but I simply want to call attention to the danger in the situation.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. So far as I know, the \$1,580,000 has never been authorized by law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, according to the ruling at the last session of Congress when a very distinguished Member of this House and a very able parliamentarian was in the chair, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], this same point of order was raised. This distinguished parliamentarian held the latter part of the paragraph subject to a point of order and also held that since the latter part of the paragraph was subject to a point of order, a point of order would be sustained and the whole paragraph would go out. So I submit to the Chair that while this is not exactly the same question that was raised at the last session, in that it contains different language, undoubtedly, under the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture, the appropriation is in order. Of course, if the gentleman does not want the balance of the paragraph in the bill, which provides that the Secretary must coordinate plans for investigation, research, and extension work so that the whole system may work in harmony, then he has the right to insist that that go out of the bill, and that would be the result

of his point of order. It would simply strike from the bill the power or the right of the Secretary of Agriculture and the officials of the colleges to meet and coordinate their activities. I therefore ask the gentleman to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. In connection with the Smith-Lever Act and the other kindred acts that are referred to in this same paragraph, I refer the gentleman to page 93 of the hearings, which shows that this appropriation is divided among the States and Hawaii in the proportion that the rural population of each bears to the total rural population of the States and Hawaii, and is available only when offset with funds.

This is not a plan which is proposed and which would be mutually agreed upon between the Secretary of Agriculture and the States, and therefore is a change in existing law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am talking about the program to carry out the work. I am not talking about the division.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is the gentleman certain that the appropriation of \$1,580,000 is authorized by law?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is authorized by the organic act, as was held at the last session.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If that is true, then the gentleman's point of order would do exactly the opposite of what he is seeking to do.

Mr. GOSS. I would like to read to the gentleman this statement of Doctor Warburton, from page 93 of the hearings:

The item of \$1,580,000 in the annual appropriation act is supplementary to that, but without specific authorization in law, so that the amount is not fixed.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Who states that?

Mr. GOSS. Doctor Warburton. So I submit to the Chair that this amount is not authorized by law.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I may say to the gentleman that my only point is this: If the amount is authorized, then the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is fatal. If it is not authorized by law then the thing to do is to strike it all out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to my colleague that Doctor Warburton did not mean to be specific in his language. This comes under the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture, and it was so held at the last session.

Mr. GOSS. Doctor Warburton also says that the appropriation has been in varying amounts which would indicate that this specific amount is not authorized by law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That question was passed on at the last Congress.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Would it be proper to ascertain from the Chair the question of the validity of the appropriation of \$1,580,000, whether based upon any existing authority of law, because I believe that it is the intention of the gentlemen interested in economy not to disturb the proviso if the appropriation is proper.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This same question was threshed out and decided at the last session.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am sure if we may have an expression from the Chair it would guide us with respect to future points of order on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. There seem to be two points of order raised upon this paragraph, one by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Would the Chair first pass upon the point raised by the gentleman from Connecticut?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would prefer to pass upon them in sequence.

Mr. TABER. I think, Mr. Chairman, it would aid orderly consideration of the bill if the Chair would first pass upon the point raised by the gentleman from Connecticut. I do

not think I would press my point of order if the other point of order is good. If the other point of order is not good, I do not know that I would want to throw out this particular language.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Texas say as to the point of order made against the \$1,580,000?

Mr. BUCHANAN. So far as the language authorizing co-operation is concerned, that may be legislation; but I do say that under the organic act creating the Agricultural Department there is ample authority for making the appropriation. That identical question was so determined in the last Congress—not on the \$1,580,000, but on a million dollars—just below in the same paragraph in the same section. I hold that decision in my hand.

Mr. GOSS. But this exact point was not up in that.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman read the decision?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let me say that the point of order was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] against the million dollars in the same paragraph or in the same section. The Chairman [Mr. BANKHEAD] says:

The Chair will cite section 511, Title V, United States Code, which seems to be very broad and comprehensive and within the purview of which the Chair is of the opinion that the committee has the authority to report this section. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman read the exact language on which the point of order was based so that we can have some comparison? A decision which is worth anything must show what it is based upon.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offered an amendment, which read as follows:

Additional cooperative agricultural extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work, including employment of specialists in economics and marketing, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States, and the Territory of Hawaii in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$1,000,000.

Mr. GOSS. I will say that that is not the same case at all. The two cases are not analogous.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It seems to me that this is a simple proposition. The section clearly refers to two specific provisions of law—the act of May 8, 1914, and the act of July 2, 1862, and acts supplementary thereto.

I have not the acts before me, but if the acts contained provision for cooperative agricultural extension work, clearly the authorization is in the Department of Agriculture. If it is not, the gentleman is in trouble.

I have sent for the statutes and I have the section here before me. It reads as follows:

341. Cooperative extension work by colleges authorized: In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics and to encourage the application of the same, there may be inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State receiving May 8, 1914, or which may thereafter receive, the benefits of the foregoing provisions of this chapter, agricultural extension work which shall be carried on in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That in any State in which two or more such colleges have been prior to May 8, 1914, or thereafter may be established the appropriations in section 343 hereinafter made to such State shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State may direct.

Now, after a reading of the law, it seems to me that is quite broad and is sufficient to sustain the appropriations under the wording of this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair agrees with the gentleman from New York that the section of the code read by him covers the question, and therefore overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act entitled 'An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agricul-

ture and mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 301-308), and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," approved May 22, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 7, secs. 343a, 343b), \$1,480,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "agriculture" in line 17, page 13. On the 5th of last December I introduced a bill in the House (H. R. 13037), providing for the allocation by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of some \$50,000,000 for continuance of the crop loans to the agricultural interests of the United States for the year 1933—just as was done in the year 1932. My information is that the fund ought really to be twice that amount. In the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act I think authority was granted for a fund of about \$200,000,000, and it is my information that about \$64,000,000 was loaned during the year 1932.

The advices which I have received indicate that that aid has been one of greatest value to the farmers of the United States, who have been and are in such great need of such assistance. It has not only been a great aid to them but it is a loan which they have appreciated and which the Department of Agriculture advises has established a remarkable record for repayment. In the Senate a few days ago, when a measure of somewhat similar character was under consideration and was unanimously adopted by the Senate, some information as to the amount of repayments on these loans was given by Senator SMITH, a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, which data he indicated were obtained from the Department of Agriculture. It showed that Alabama has paid back 81 per cent plus; Arkansas, 75 per cent plus; Georgia, 90 per cent plus; Louisiana, 94 per cent plus; Mississippi, 77 per cent plus; North Carolina, 91 per cent plus; Oklahoma, 59 per cent plus; South Carolina, 87 per cent plus; Tennessee, 56 per cent plus; Texas, 88 per cent plus; and with the collateralization of the commodities pledged insures practically a return of between 90 and 100 per cent of all of the loans which were made to these distressed farmers of the United States; in fact, they could not have gotten along without them. It is highly essential in my State that these loans be continued for another year, as it is in other States of the Union. In order to do any real good in Texas—the State that I have the honor in part to represent—as well as to be of benefit throughout the South, it is essential that this loan fund be made available soon, at least by the 15th of January, because the planting season is at its height at that time. The chairman of the governor's advisory committee of Texas, who, I think, was appointed by the governor at the instance of the President, has indicated that his committee has found these crop loans to be of the greatest benefit to the farmers. He says:

In taking stock of what has been accomplished in Texas in the way of helpfulness to the farmers of the State by the crop-production loans during the year 1932, I am so much impressed with the vast good which has been accomplished that I feel, as the chairman of the committee appointed by the Governor of Texas, that it is my duty to call your attention to the absolute necessity for crop-production loans for the year 1933. Unless you were here on the ground and familiar with it as I am, having been in all parts of the State, and were conversant with what has been done, you could not begin to realize how great is the help which has been given through the means of the crop-production loan made by the office of Owen W. Sherrill, regional manager.

In response to my interest in the situation, the regional director in Texas of the Department of Agriculture advised me recently as follows:

We have endeavored to place constructive agriculture and a firm determination to work harder than ever, along with the highest possible prepayment record, even in advance of the maturity of the loans. Frankly, I think you will find our borrowers in a better physical condition to carry themselves through than they were last year, even though they are naked and have no money. After collecting from them we have left a better morale and more to live on than many of them have ever seen. One east Texas farmer writes that he has the first winter garden he ever saw. Many were encouraged to replant after first plantings were a failure, instead of giving up. There are numerous cases in Texas of other farmers, whose crops were a failure, developing other resources; they went into adjoining cotton fields, sawmills, road work, and repaid their crop-production loans, as appreciation of the Government's confidence placed in them.

I was in an east Texas county last week, where we made over 600 loans, averaging \$50 each, totaling \$30,000. We were advised

by the business interests there that there would be twice the number of loans needed another year—not for larger amounts, not primarily for food and feed, as our borrowers have been encouraged to provide this—but when you realize that these farmers have not been able to have any surplus cash for three years with which to buy clothes, work shoes, and to repair their tools for farming operations, and that many of them may not have seed to plant, the picture is reflected that frankly there will be twice the need and emergency in January as there was the past year. This same east Texas county has applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for funds for their unemployed, as is happening in many other Texas counties to-day. Farmer programs discontinued can double the unemployed ranks very rapidly.

Stabilized farm programs can be maintained perhaps with a greater economy and the money returned quicker, as is demonstrated by a few facts I would have you consider in passing regarding this office, as indicated below. It looks like the bottom of the structure needs holding together now as never before, for upholding of the morale and holding under farmers a working determination.

Did I have the opportunity to personally paint you the picture in Texas, which this office perhaps is closer to than any now operating in Texas, from the country banker to the farmer, landowner, and tenant, I could show you things that I do not care to take your time in reading here.

You realize that the country bankers and farmers are looking to Congress for action at the December session. Our program is the earliest in the United States. Some could wait until March. There will be many desertions without a hope to tie to by December Congress' failure to take action. The strengthening of the morale at this time and mass psychology is the great step forward and needed most to-day.

For your information I also submit a communication from the regional director, showing the status of crop-production loans in my own district, as of November 30, 1932:

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
CROP PRODUCTION LOAN OFFICE,
Dallas, Tex., December 6, 1932.

Hon. CLAY STONE BRIGGS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following is a condensed statement of the status of the 1932 crop-production loans in the seventh congressional district on due date, November 30, 1932:

County	Total number of loans	Total amount of loans	Cash paid Nov. 30, 1932
Anderson.....	197	\$12,823.78	\$8,288.26
Chambers.....	21	1,676.50	662.22
Galveston.....	19	3,376.00	737.97
Trinity.....	273	16,923.68	15,636.86
Houston.....	288	19,754.84	15,519.66
Liberty.....	204	14,812.96	7,995.21
Montgomery.....	313	23,949.12	13,018.42
Polk.....	206	12,700.45	10,939.28
San Jacinto.....	110	7,466.10	4,070.14
Walker.....	120	7,368.99	4,716.16
Total.....	1,751	120,852.42	81,584.18

In order that you may compare your district with the State as a whole, the following are the corresponding figures for Texas:

Total number of loans..... 34,677
Total amount of loans..... \$3,221,620.86
Cash paid November 30, 1932..... \$1,341,836.94

In addition, cotton having a collateral value in excess of \$1,250,000 has been received by the Dallas office.

In spite of drought during the growing season in some counties, excessive weevil infestation, and extremely low prices, your people have made a remarkable record of cash payments before due date. Fig and truck growers were almost without a market of any kind.

Our inspectors report that the collateralization of cotton will liquidate nearly 100 per cent of the loans in the cotton counties. When you consider that the borrower was a farmer with little or no local credit, I am sure that you share our pride in the splendid record they are making.

Inclosed is a brief summary of the activities of the Dallas office, which I hope will be of interest to you.

Yours very truly,

OWEN W. SHERRILL, Regional Director.

I appeal to the Committee on Banking and Currency, having in charge this legislation, to report it out immediately and get it before the House, so that it can be passed and the fund be made available with the least possible delay. I am aware that last year in the enactment of the legislation amending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, provision was made for what is known as regional agricultural credit corporations; but those credit corporations have not functioned in a way that have enabled the farmers with small resources to get loans. These corporations have demanded so much security over and above the crops which were pledged that it is impossible for most of the farmers to

obtain the loan. In the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act originally passed it was provided that the crops themselves should be regarded as sufficient security. Notwithstanding the remarkable record of repayment of the loans, the regional credit corporations refuse to accept crops as sufficient security. Country banks are unable to make these advances, as they assert they have advanced as much as they can. Without this aid from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Secretary of Agriculture, or an allotment of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the farming interests of the United States are going to undergo a vast amount of additional suffering; and, therefore, I urge upon the Committee on Banking and Currency and this House the necessity for most expeditious and favorable action on this proposal.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. GLOVER. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement, and I have had many letters recently urging that these loans be continued. In addition to what the gentleman stated with reference to the 75 to 90 per cent being repaid, is it not also true, when an additional loan is made, that the balance left over is included in the other, so that in the end the Government will lose nothing?

Mr. BRIGGS. Absolutely nothing. The department tells me that with the collateral they hold they expect these loans to be paid practically 100 per cent.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have heard criticism of the policy of the Secretary of Agriculture in making loans on crops, so far as settlements are concerned, so that the result is that those who borrow from the Government in the matter of cotton, to which the gentleman refers, are getting a settlement on the basis of 8 or 9 cents a pound, whereas ordinary growers who borrow their money through commercial channels receive 5 and 6 cents a pound for their crop.

I am just wondering what the gentleman has in mind as to the removal of this discrimination that has resulted in a great deal of criticism, if anything.

Mr. BRIGGS. The 9 cents a pound provision, as I understand it, only has relation to the figure at which the collateral will be carried until a definite date before the collateral is disposed of if the loans are not repaid; for any unpaid balance the farmer is still liable. But it is not a price fixed by the department or by the Government or by anybody else as a basis for extinguishment of the loan. It is simply that borrowers may be given an opportunity of the payment of these loans without undue hardship or distress. In my own State and district most of the loans are repaid the Government before the due date.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. By the Government accepting cotton at 2 or 3 cents a pound more than the market price?

Mr. BRIGGS. No. In cash repayment. It is not through the Government accepting the collateral at a higher rate than can be obtained on the market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] for his effort in trying to secure some information from the Department of Agriculture with reference to the administration of the seed loans and crop-production loans. I have only gone over the hearings hurriedly, but I can see the gentleman had considerable trouble trying to get any information from the department.

I know something with reference to how the seed loan and crop production acts have been administered. Since Congress adjourned last July the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, who comes from my State, found in his home town of Trenton, Mo., a gentleman engaged in distributing Ford automobiles, by the name of Mr. Don C. McVay, and he brought Mr. McVay to Washington. On July 16 he gave Mr. McVay a position as manager of the field office for the crop-production loans, located in the city of Washington, at a salary of \$4,800 per year. Mr. McVay evidently knows so

much more about seed loans and crop production than he knows about selling Fords, for his services appear to be so valuable that the Secretary of Agriculture, on October 16, designated the gentleman as chief administrator of the farm seed loan office, directly under the Secretary of Agriculture, and increased his salary to \$7,200 a year. Not so bad for a country automobile agent.

Now, there is a seed-loan office and a crop-production-loan office in the city of St. Louis. It is in the extreme eastern end of the district that it serves, and I understand it was placed there for the purpose of requiring the people who desired loans to correspond with the office rather than appear in person. At one time there were over 450 people working in the offices. At the outset they took people from the civil service register, but shortly thereafter it became a political hotbed. Nobody could get a position in the office who did not have the indorsement of a Republican Congressman or Senator or the Republican national committeemen. I will have considerable to say with reference to that condition at a later date.

They are doing nothing but liquidating the loans; but they have on their pay rolls to-day, aside from the office force, 55 men, and they have had them there for many, many months drawing \$150 and more per month. What are they doing? They have their own automobiles, for which they receive an allowance daily for the amount of gasoline and oil that they use. They also receive \$5 a day subsistence, and they are traveling over the State where loans have been made and they are telling the farmer, "Now, John, do not forget that you owe the Government \$50 or \$75. Pay Uncle Sam one of these days"—work that a letter could perform. That is the extent of their work as far as the Government is concerned. As I told the manager out there, "I guess they speak to John about two minutes about his loan and then go on to tell him what a great party the Republican Party is," because they were very active during the campaign, and they were also active in the St. Louis office in the campaign.

Now, this is the outstanding feature of the administration: During the campaign, as we all know, for some reason the colored brethren started deserting the Republican Party, so they had to do something to get them back in line. About a month before the election they opened another office in St. Louis, two blocks away from the regular office. Of course, they had to pay rent, and there they placed in charge a colored man by the name of Dr. J. R. A. Crossland, and the doctor was given 10 assistants, all colored people, to travel out into the various districts, receiving the same pay as the other agents, also subsistence and automobile expenses.

It seems "the doctor" immediately became very active and he started sending out letters. I have one of the letters which happened to come into my possession, which he wrote, and which I desire to place in the RECORD:

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
CROP PRODUCTION LOAN OFFICE,
St. Louis, Mo., October 28, 1932.

DEAR FRIEND: Your letter, requesting information as to the Government loans to farmers, has been received in this office.

This office has been created, under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to aid colored farmers. Loans are made to farmers on livestock, farm land, and other articles that can be offered as proper security. If you wish a loan on any of your farm property or produce, make application to this office, stating clearly the number of acres that you have, the amount of indebtedness that you have on same at the present time, the number of livestock that you have, the location of your farm, its productive value, and the amount that you wish to borrow.

Upon receipt of this application in this office, made in letter form, we shall proceed further to inform you as to the possibilities of your securing a loan. We have no literature at present on the farm loans, but your application will be submitted to the director in charge of the bank for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and will receive the attention that is necessary to put the loan through.

Very truly yours,

Dr. J. R. A. Crossland,
Special Supervisor, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Under the very act they could not have loaned a dime at the time that letter was written, because they were not permitted to make any more loans. But he said that office

had been opened for the purpose of making loans, and he was addressing the colored people. They segregated the applications of colored farmers and white farmers, and they turned the applications of the colored farmers over to Doctor Crossland; but I understand since I made a lot of noise out there, they are going to close up that branch office.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Would the gentleman call that "biological Jim Crowing"? [Laughter.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Now, they have had hundreds of people working there in St. Louis, and some of those in charge of the office have had and now have members of their family on the pay roll. There is not only one such instance, but there are many. They gave a good job to the wife of a policeman.

They dismissed Democrats and civil-service employees, saying the force was to be reduced and put Republicans to work in a few days. They discharged a wife whose husband was in a city institution with tuberculosis; they discharged a lady who was taking care of her aged parents, her sister, and brother-in-law with their three children; they discharged another lady with an invalid father; why two-thirds of the people dismissed had dependents, while married women with husbands working were retained. The personnel clerk has members of his family on the pay roll. The original manager, later sent to an office in Texas, had a member of his family in the office, while competent civil-service employees were turned out with no place in sight to secure employment. I know of one case where the lady told me she had to appeal to a charitable organization for food for her family after she was dismissed.

After I made the statement that I proposed to look into the administration of the office, the Secretary sent an assistant to St. Louis, and I understand he has done a little house cleaning.

They administered the office in St. Louis in such way that I say it is the most willful waste of public money that has ever been called to my attention.

If we are going to have any more seed loans or any more crop-production loans, let us safeguard them in such way to see that they are properly administered.

The Secretary of Agriculture has refused to permit the Comptroller General to audit his accounts in regard to the loan activities. He has employees of one of the leading firms of the country auditing the accounts of this seed-loan office and crop-production-loan office. The Secretary of Agriculture absolutely refuses to give any information with reference to the administration of this act, saying that he is now nothing but an agent of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and that information must come from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I have just secured a copy of a decision by the Attorney General in which he upholds the Secretary of Agriculture and contends that the accounts do not have to be audited by the Comptroller General.

I say, Mr. Chairman, when millions of dollars of such funds have been disbursed by these officers, we should have some audit by some governmental agent, and I hope the bills which are brought in here in the future will contain some provision to take care of this situation.

I called on the manager of the St. Louis office. He showed me a book 2 inches thick and said, "We are running under regulations." I glanced through the book. One regulation was that if a check was received in that office and the check could not clear at par, the check was to be returned to the man who sent it, who had borrowed money from the Government. Do you know of any city or country bank that does not make a charge for clearing a check? Why, not a check that came in that office could clear at par. I asked him what he was doing under such circumstances. He said under the regulations he had to return the check. I asked him if it would not be better to give the man credit for the amount he transmitted less 10 cents for the clearing charge on the check. He said he would not be permitted to do that, but that he would take it up with the department.

You have no idea how those offices have been run. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, some provision should be made in the

bills that are brought in here in the future to provide for the proper administration of these lump-sum appropriations, for under a lump-sum appropriation they are not subject in any way to civil-service regulations, or any but their own regulations, and the Comptroller General is not required or permitted to audit their accounts; in fact, they seem to be immune from everything.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman has brought up a rather serious proposition here, it seems to me, in his statement that the Secretary of Agriculture has declined to allow the Comptroller General to make any audit of the public expenditures in his department.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes, sir; based upon a decision of the Attorney General.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Attorney General has confirmed his attitude upon that question?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Absolutely.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Taking the position that the Secretary of Agriculture, acting in this particular capacity, is not the Secretary of Agriculture per se but is only a designated agent of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Is that the idea?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That is the idea.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If that state of facts exists, I think it thoroughly justifies the position which is now being taken by some gentlemen pretty high in authority that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation itself and all of its operations should be subjected to very severe and searching scrutiny as to how it has administered the public funds intrusted to its hands; and, incidentally, it seems to me if this is done, we could reach the accounts of the Secretary of Agriculture by an investigation of the parent organization under which he is assuming to act. I think it is a matter of very grave public importance and that the Congress of the United States, through power conferred upon a select committee, should be clothed with power and jurisdiction to look into the question of how the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has dealt, in detail, with these large public funds intrusted to its control and direction. I am sure that such an investigation would not be resented by the corporation, and possibly welcomed.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman from Alabama that if he will get the annual report of the Comptroller General for 1932, he will find that under the head of "Suggestions and Comments," pages 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, he goes into this matter in great detail. He has outlined there all the correspondence that has been exchanged between the Comptroller General's office and the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and his own office.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, which is controlled by a majority of Democrats. I suggest, as a Republican member of the committee, that the gentleman call a meeting of the committee to-morrow and start an investigation of the troubles about which he now complains on the floor of the House. It would be highly appropriate because we still have two months more of this session, and the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures, which is charged with the duty of seeing that public funds are expended in accordance with law, certainly should not let this go by without investigation.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that I have been making a preliminary investigation and that I secured Mr. Brown, of the Bureau of Efficiency, to

give me some assistance. He was denied by the Secretary of Agriculture the right to get information I wanted, and it was only last night that he reported to me. At the first meeting of the committee it is my intention to call this to the attention of the committee.

Mr. SCHAFER. When will that first meeting be—why not make it to-morrow?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman that I checked the roll call of yesterday, and I find that a quorum of the committee is not present. As soon as a quorum is present, a meeting of the committee will be called. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Additional cooperative agricultural extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work, including employment of specialists in economics and marketing, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purpose.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This is exactly the same point of order ruled on a while ago.

Mr. GOSS. This is the same point of order that the gentleman made against my amendment, and his point of order was sustained by the Chair. So I have no doubt the Chair will sustain this point of order, I may say to my friend from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Connecticut against the paragraph, inasmuch as the proviso contains legislation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: Page 13, after line 23, insert the following: "Additional cooperative agricultural extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work, including employment of specialists in economics and marketing, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$1,000,000."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that amendment that it is not authorized by law. The amendment starts out by stating "additional cooperative agricultural extension work," and "for additional cooperative agricultural extension work." In other words, the gentleman has simply left off the proviso of the paragraph and I submit the \$1,000,000 is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

This identical point of order was raised last year on an identical amendment and was overruled by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. BANKHEAD. The Chair, therefore, basing his decision upon the reasoning of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole in the last session, overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agricultural exhibits at fairs: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make suitable agricultural exhibits at State, interstate, and international fairs held within the United States; for the purchase of necessary supplies and equipment; for telephone and telegraph service, freight and express charges; for travel, and for every other expense necessary, including the employment of assistance in or outside the city of Washington, \$90,000.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 16, after the word "Washington," strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$10,000."

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have made a study of the hearings on this matter, and I fail to find where there is any need for an appropriation as large as \$90,000.

The fact is that fairs are almost obsolete. People are out of employment; we have 5-cent cotton, 30-cent wheat, and 6-cent tobacco, and the people are not able to attend the fairs. States are not attempting to keep up the fairs, and we have no more county fairs. So it looks to me that here is certainly one place where we can economize.

I have left a small amount, \$10,000, to keep up the work of the organization. I do not think that will be called for, but it will provide the Agricultural Department with funds sufficient to notify the few fairs that make requests for exhibits that the funds were not appropriated by Congress. None of this \$90,000 appropriation goes to the farmer to pay his expenses in making exhibits or as premiums on his exhibits.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BANKHEAD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLGOOD) there were—ayes 25, noes 13.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of chief of bureau and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$125,975.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 13, after the word "Columbia," strike out the sum "\$125,975" and insert "\$60,000."

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am proposing to strike out a larger amount in this amendment. If you are going to strike down the bureaus and bureaucrats, you have to begin somewhere. I know that the Weather Bureau is a necessary adjunct of the Government, but upon reading the hearings I find that in 1923 the appropriation for the Weather Bureau was \$1,925,225, and in 1932 it had risen to the enormous amount of \$4,497,720. I do not think we have any more weather now than we had in 1923, and I know that the farmers have not any more to protect, and what they have to protect is not worth as much as it was in 1923.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I want to call the gentleman's attention to a fact that he has overlooked that we have more activities placed upon the Weather Bureau than we had 10 years ago. There are the aerological and the meteorological observations which go to the service of aviation.

Mr. ALLGOOD. These items are not in the amendment which I have introduced.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman was talking about the entire Weather Bureau appropriation, and I wanted to call his attention to that.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I know; but the part that I am striking at now does not affect that, because there is an additional appropriation carried for that.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I understand that, but the gentleman was referring to the increased appropriations for the Weather Bureau.

Mr. ALLGOOD. There is duplication. I have not time to go into it, but the hearings show that there is duplication of this work. Doctor Marvin says (p. 121 of the hearings in reply to an inquiry by Mr. BUCHANAN):

You are quite correct in saying that meteorological observations and reports, general forecasts and warnings, and climatology are a good deal alike. Well, they are alike; but, after all, there are rather clear distinctions.

So there is duplication of the work, and with the conditions as they are to-day, economically, it seems to me we ought to cut down on these expenditures; we ought to economize. Individuals have had to cut down on all of their requirements, and the farmer is expecting us to cut down on expenditures here. I know some good is obtained

from these weather reports, but, as I said a while ago, the farmer has not as much to protect to-day as he had to protect in 1923, and what he has to protect is not worth one-fourth what it was in 1923, and yet it is costing as much again to protect it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1932 the amount appropriated by Congress for the Weather Bureau was \$4,497,720. That has been gradually decreased since we started our campaign of economy, until in this bill it is \$3,731,225, or \$432,000 below the bill for this fiscal year and \$766,000 below the appropriations for 1932. If you gentlemen want to keep up your airways and your weather service, you would better approve this appropriation as it is, because this bureau has been cut to the bone.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. I heartily agree with all that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD] has said with reference to reducing appropriations. I do not think we can be too vigilant in our effort to cut down appropriations, and should cut to the bone. But we hear a great deal about consolidations. I submit to my good friend that if you undertake to cripple this particular service to an extent greater than that to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has alluded, you are liable to create several bureaus in several departments of the Government before you finish, and they will cost a great deal more than this bureau is costing, for the reason that you can not operate an air service unless you have some activity which will give the air service information as to weather conditions. If you undertake to cut it out here or cripple this service, you are going to have the Army and the Navy and the air mail service in the Postal Department all requesting appropriations to give them the benefit of weather information necessary to protect life. It seems to me that you will make a great mistake if you undertake to cut this down, because it will ultimately cost more money in the future than it does now.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Then under the name of agriculture you are protecting the War Department and the Post Office Department and the Navy Department by this appropriation?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLGOOD. That is what it is driving up to.

Mr. BYRNS. No; this applies not only for the benefit of agriculture but it is used to give people generally information as to weather conditions, and we are simply utilizing this service in order to save money and to furnish information which would cost a great deal more money if it should come from other sources.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to the fact that the only reason this appropriation is in the Department of Agriculture is that originally the weather forecast was instituted as an aid in bringing weather-condition information to the farmers. It was there; and instead of establishing, as suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], several bureaus, one in the Army and one in the Navy, one in the Lighthouse Service, and one in the Department of Commerce, the bureau naturally acquired these new activities. There is no one here who would for a moment suggest, in the name of economy, the abolition of our Lighthouse Service, for the simple reason that we are accustomed to the necessity of lighthouses as a guide to navigation.

We have come now to a new method of transportation, absolutely new. It suddenly came upon us, and we learned, after the experience in the World War, that here was a new method of transportation that could be used for commercial purposes. The gentlemen will remember in the early days of the Postal Service of the air mail that it was doubted whether we could make a success of it. Some of us stated that it would be interrupted by reason of weather conditions. In the meantime there was developed a new science in meteorology, namely, that of ascertaining weather conditions and imparting the information. To-day it has developed to such a state of perfection that in large planes the

pilot sits in his seat and with ear phones hears radio reports every few minutes on his journey as to the exact condition of the weather ahead of him. He is thereby able to change his route to avoid storms; and, with the radiobeacon and blind flying we will in a very short time be able to continue and keep up daily operations of aviation service regardless of weather conditions. I call attention to the fact that there is a total reduction here in the Weather Bureau of \$212,866, out of a total appropriation of \$3,700,000.

The committee went \$7,048 below the Budget reduction of \$205,418, and I submit it would be extremely dangerous at this time to reduce this item by one cent. I predict now that the time will come when the aerial service, when the duties of this one department of the Weather Bureau will be so great in connection with aviation that then if it is desired to have it taken out of the Department of Agriculture it can be transferred to another department, but the total cost will not be less. This is one item where the appropriation is bound to increase from year to year by reason of the increased service necessary owing to this new method of transportation.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. There is nothing in the hearings to show that the aviation department or airplanes get any benefit from this?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Oh, yes. If the gentleman will refer to page 130 of the hearings.

Mr. ALLGOOD. But that does not have to do with this item.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We are discussing the appropriation for the entire Weather Bureau.

Mr. ALLGOOD. We have not reached that yet.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman's amendment is to the amount expended in the District of Columbia and it is for administration. Of course, administration will increase with increased activities. If there is one item in this bill that is justified, I think it is this item.

Mr. ALLGOOD. As far as the farmer is concerned, he knows when it is hot enough or cold enough to plant his crops.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aerology: For the maintenance of stations for observing, measuring, and investigating atmospheric phenomena, including salaries and other expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$1,280,605.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he will kindly give the committee the benefit of a little more extended discussion of this service of the Weather Bureau as between the departments. A few moments ago the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations referred to the growth of the demand for information that comes from this bureau, particularly in the development of air service in various departments of the Government. I am wondering if the gentleman will take two or three minutes to enlarge upon that thought, because, it seems to me, that it is a very important consideration in the determination of the appropriation that shall be made here. Can the gentleman tell, for instance, to-day whether there is any other department of the Government that is undertaking to begin its own development of the information that is supplied through the Weather Bureau of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In view of the fact that we are making appropriations for the Weather Bureau in this appropriation bill, the other departments are relying upon it for the necessary information.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is there any arrangement for any credit, book or otherwise, given by those departments to the Department of Agriculture for the service that is rendered?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The air service is complete within itself.

Mr. KETCHAM. But is it not true that if the Department of Agriculture is to be charged with the responsibility—and I agree we ought to have a unified service—if the Department of Agriculture is to be criticized, as it has been criticized by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD], by reason of the extension of this service, ought there not be some arrangement whereby, if other departments receive the benefit of these services, at least the Department of Agriculture ought to have a book credit for it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Only \$40,000,000 is carried in this bill for agriculture primarily. The other \$70,000,000 is for other interests that do not relate to agriculture any more than to the general good of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. KETCHAM. That emphasizes the very point I am making. The Department of Agriculture frequently is criticized even by its friends because of service rendered and appropriations made that have no direct connection with it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly. They are superimposed upon the Department of Agriculture, and they take up that duty and discharge it, but it is not primarily for the benefit of agriculture.

Mr. KETCHAM. But it seems to me that, notwithstanding the fact that all appropriations come out of the same Treasury, at least the Department of Agriculture ought to receive some credit somewhere for rendering this service, and the friends of agriculture ought not be criticized because the appropriations for that department rise to the amounts they do.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield gladly to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS. All of these services are intertwined, especially with reference to this particular service. For instance, if the gentleman were an aviator and he were in the War Department or the Navy Department, or if he were in the Post Office Department delivering air mail, or operating an airplane as a commercial aviator, he would be able to receive through the radio from time to time as he progressed along his route, or as he reached a particular station, information as to just what the weather conditions were over the mountain or 100 miles beyond. That is service that comes through the radio. Of course, the information which is relayed comes through this Weather Service, but, after all, here is one great big business of the Government. All the funds come out of the Treasury, and it does not matter so much whether they are charged to one department or another. After all it is charged to the people of the United States, and, therefore, these departments should be expected one to serve the other whenever it can be done to promote efficiency and at the same time save money.

Mr. KETCHAM. I agree with the gentleman entirely; but I am asking now, in order to make my inquiry have some meaning, if he can advise the committee what proportion of the amount of service we are appropriating for in this single item can be properly charged to the Department of Agriculture alone?

Mr. BYRNS. No. I have no such information. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] is more familiar with these agricultural appropriations than anybody else on the floor of this House, but I dare say that he could not give that information, and the bureau itself could not, with any degree of accuracy. Why? Because this information is collected and then it is disseminated, as I have said, some of it for this and some for other purposes, and is supposed to be for the benefit of the general public. They can not say just how much it costs to give information to some aviator who may be traveling from here to Michigan, for instance.

Mr. KETCHAM. As a general proposition, would it be fair to say that 75 per cent of this particular item could be properly charged to other departments if it could be so separated?

Mr. BYRNS. I would not think so, but I have no definite knowledge.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not over one-fifth or one-sixth of it could be charged to agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want to say to my friend the gentleman from Michigan that I do not think it makes any difference just what proportion of the appropriation contained in the agricultural appropriation bill goes for the benefit of the farmer as long as it is a public necessity, as long as the appropriations are wisely expended and service is rendered.

My good friend from Connecticut [Mr. Goss] who looks after the Army appropriation bill and is very much interested in the Army, might get up and say during discussion of the War Department appropriation bill, "Why should we be criticized for spending so much for national defense? Here is \$50,000,000 for subsistence of the Army. That should be charged to the Department of Agriculture because the farmer gets the benefit of it." Such an argument would be along the same line of reasoning.

Now, it is true that we have in this Agricultural appropriation bill the money spent on roads. That was a good place to put it originally, I suppose, in the early days when the roads did affect primarily the farmer. We have outgrown that now, and the roads are just as much a necessity and a benefit to the people of the city as they are to the individual farmer out in the rural districts.

There has been a great deal of misapprehension as to how these services grew up, and I think that is one of the reasons the Economy Committees have been confused, and I think it has also confused the Chief Executive in some of the very unwise recommendations he has made in some of the Executive orders.

You can unscramble these departments if you want to, but as you unscramble them and seek to readjust them you are not saving any money. These departments did not grow up overnight. They are the natural growth of our development, of the necessary and ever-increasing new functions of government. The functions of government are the things that are increasing, and this increase is the result of the very involved and complex industrial and economic system under which we live. Of course everyone who is under supervision or regulation or control of some Government department is anxious to have that department abolished so they can go back to their old habits.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. Of course I do not at all quarrel with the gentleman's proposition, but what I attempted to do was to bring out the point that this serves very well under the Department of Agriculture, where it was originally, but having developed as it has developed it ought to be brought out, and that is what I sought to do, that a large part of the demand has come by reason of the growth of this service in other departments.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is true.

Mr. KETCHAM. I do not want it charged entirely against the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman can add to that roads; he can add other items in the bill, but on the other hand let it be said that agriculture is getting a good and fair proportion of what we appropriate, and we city folks are glad to help get the appropriation whenever it is necessary and really beneficial to the farmer.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLGOOD: Page 19, line 13, after the word "elsewhere," strike out "\$1,280,605" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600,000."

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] is sold on the air, but the farmer is not so much interested in air as he is interested on what takes place on the earth.

The appropriation for this item in 1932 was \$1,709,340. The appropriation has been reduced this year to \$1,280,605. My contention is that the appropriation could be cut half, in

two, and I believe it still would give adequate service to the air forces.

This is another subsidy to the air mail service, to the Post Office Department. They already have a subsidy of \$20,000,000 from this Congress for air mail. The farmers of this country are not demanding air mail. They get their checks back quick enough by a 3-cent stamp, let alone an 8-cent air mail stamp. They are demanding better commodity prices and reduction of expenditures by Congress. Here is another place where the expenditures can and should be reduced.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this is a subsidy to air mail, then why is it not a subsidy to the farmer to give him the information he needs with reference to the weather?

There is something besides air mail that needs this service. How about the millions of people who are traveling in airplanes throughout this country? It seems to me it would be a grave mistake to cripple this service. I know it to be a fact that when the airship *San Francisco* crashed against a mountain on its way to California, the United States Weather Bureau service at Denver notified the field from which it left before it departed that there would be severe electrical storms along the path the airship was going to fly. I know it to be a fact that the United States Weather Bureau warnings were disregarded, but I am happy to say that since that time orders have been issued by all the great corporations which require the planes to remain on the ground when warnings of this character are received from the United States Weather Bureau.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The gentleman speaks of the thousands of people who are able to travel by air; how about the millions of people, the ten millions of people, who are out of employment and can not get jobs, who are walking, and not able to ride?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Some of these people riding in an airplane are using them for the purpose of securing orders for goods which will put many of these men back into employment, people to whom time means something.

Mr. ALLGOOD. What does time mean to the farmers who are getting 5 cents for cotton, 6 cents for tobacco, and 30 cents for wheat?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Congress has been very good to the farmer; do not overlook that. The efforts have failed miserably I admit. Take the \$500,000,000 for the Farm Board that is lost to the people.

Mr. ALLGOOD. This bill is crammed full of injustices, inequalities, and inequities, and we are using the farmer as a smoke screen for it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is the gentleman active in trying to secure this seed loan for farmers I have been talking about?

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that we will find that but a small percentage of the seed loans that have been made have been paid back to the Government. I am not complaining, but I do not want it said the farmer has been overlooked when it came to appropriating public funds. It seems to me if we will repeal all the laws we have enacted affecting the farmer and leave him alone for a while he might fare better. Since Congress began to tinker with his business, the prices of farm products have steadily declined. Therefore, I say let him alone for a while and see how he comes out. If he were getting the same prices for his products now that he was receiving before Congress passed all the laws I refer to, the farmer would be happy and the country better off.

But there is some one else to be considered by the Government of the United States besides the farmer. I am in favor of helping the farmer because until the farmer prospers we know the country can not prosper. The gentleman is attacking an item and I oppose him because I do not think his reasons for the attack are sound, and, therefore, I think

the amendment ought to be defeated and urge the committee to vote it down. This service is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the last quarter of a century many suggestions have been made that the efficiency of the service rendered by the various departments of the Government could be greatly advanced and many economies effected by consolidations of bureaus within the same department, and the transfer of bureaus from one department to another. This sentiment crystallized to the extent that during the first session of the present Congress, in section 401 of title 4, Part II, of the legislative appropriation act of June 30, 1932, the following declaration was made as to the policy of the Congress in relation to the reorganization of executive and administrative agencies:

In order to further reduce expenditures and increase efficiency in Government it is declared to be the policy of Congress:

(a) To group, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purpose;

(b) To reduce the number of such agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head;

(c) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

(d) To segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character. (47 Stat. 413.)

Pursuant to this declaration of policy, section 403 of the same title and part of the above referred to act authorized the President by Executive order for the purpose of carrying out the policy of Congress so declared:

(1) To transfer the whole or any part of any independent executive agency, and/or the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of an executive department or another independent executive agency;

(2) To transfer the whole or any part of any executive agency, and/or the functions thereof, from the jurisdiction and control of another executive department; or

(3) To consolidate or redistribute the functions vested in any executive department or in the executive agencies included in any executive department; and

(4) To designate and fix the name and functions of any consolidated activity or executive agency and the title, powers, and duties of its executive head. (47 Stat. 413, 5 U. S. C. A. 126.)

This authority is, however, limited by section 406 of the same title and part of the act in the following manner:

Whenever, in carrying out the provisions of this subchapter, the President concludes that any executive department or agency created by statute should be abolished and the functions thereof transferred to another executive department or agency or eliminated entirely the authority granted in this subchapter shall not apply, and he shall report his conclusions to Congress, with such recommendations as he may deem proper. (47 Stat. 414, 5 U. S. C. A. 129.)

The next succeeding section of the statute, 407, provides that such transfers by Executive order shall become effective 60 calendar days after their transmission to Congress unless approved sooner by concurrent resolution or disapproved by resolution of either House.

On December 9, 1932, President Hoover transmitted to the Congress, among others, a proposed Executive order reading in part as follows:

(2) The General Land Office, which is hereby transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture.

I am heartily in favor of any plan of reorganization or consolidation which will effectively reduce expenditures and increase efficiency in the Government, but I wish to state most emphatically, in my opinion the transfer of the General Land Office from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture would not be in the interests of efficiency or economy.

The President's message contains the following statement regarding the functions and activities of the General Land Office, but it contains no reason why it would be to the advantage of the Government from the standpoint of efficiency or economy to make such a transfer.

The General Land Office is charged with the adjudication of applications and claims involving the disposition of public lands under the public land laws and the recording of all matters affecting the public lands and their disposition and status; the adjudication of applications for oil and gas leases, prospecting permits, coal-mining permits, leases, and licenses, and potash, phosphate, sodium, and sulphur permits and leases; the adjudication of applications to lease the public lands for fur farming, grazing, the free use of timber, and for various other purposes; the granting of rights of way over the public lands; the execution of surveys and resurveys of the public lands; the preparation and maintenance of plats and field notes thereof; the making of investigations to determine compliance with law by claimants under the public land laws; the determination of the mineral or nonmineral character of public lands and the feasibility of irrigation projects in connection with individual claims or entries; and the investigation of trespass on the public domain and adjudication of trespass cases.

The work of the General Land Office deals directly with problems concerning the public domain and the conservation of the natural resources of the public lands. It also relates to many agricultural problems. This work should be intimately associated with the other activities of the Federal Government pertaining to the public domain and conservation and agricultural matters. It is therefore proposed to transfer the General Land Office to the Department of Agriculture.

It does not appear from the record that any officer of the Interior Department, including those of the General Land Office, was consulted, nor that any Senator or Representative in Congress from a public-land State was asked for an expression of opinion regarding the proposed transfer of the General Land Office to the Department of Agriculture.

The whole plan seems to have originated at a national conference on land utilization called by the Secretary of Agriculture which was held at Chicago last year. This conference appointed two national committees—one on national land planning, the other on the utilization of land. This conference appears to have been composed of representatives from the Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges, whose knowledge of the administration of the laws affecting the public lands is largely theoretical.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman's position is illustrative of what happens when any general reorganization program of the executive departments is suggested. Almost everybody has some private hobby in connection with the different services of the Government, and a great many are willing to join in a movement to block any general reorganization in order to protect the service in which they are particularly interested; and if, as individual Members of Congress, we are not willing to surrender our particular hobbies for the general welfare, Congress will never accept a general reorganization program such as the President has recommended. As was said by a distinguished Senator during the last session of Congress, if we want to do anything more than render "lip service" to this idea of reorganization, we must leave it to the Executive.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I can not yield further, Mr. Chairman.

If these recommendations were made after due consideration, after hearings before the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the Committee on Mines and Mining, and the Committee on Indian Affairs, or if the Congress had considered and approved the transfer, it would be an entirely different proposition; but, as I stated in the beginning of my remarks, this is a proposition that is not even supported by the Secretary of the Interior himself or by any officer of the Interior Department; and it has never been considered by any committee of Congress having to do with public-land questions.

Mr. MAPES. That may be one of the most potent reasons why it should be done.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I do not yield further. I wish to reiterate, however, that this recommendation comes here as part of the message of the President recommending cer-

tain consolidations without any reasons on which the action is based. I have direct information from the Bureau of the Budget that they gave the matter no detailed consideration. There were no hearings held. It was simply a theoretical idea that was suggested by officers of the Department of Agriculture, and action was taken without any consultation with any officer of the Interior Department or any Senator or Representative from the public-land States.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. Where does the gentleman get his information that these consolidations are merely theoretical ideas?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I get it directly from Mr. McReynolds, of the Bureau of the Budget, with whom I talked personally over the phone. I asked him for copy of any hearings or any recommendations that had been submitted upon which they based their conclusion.

Mr. DOWELL. Does not the gentleman recall that the Congress asked the President to do exactly what he has done in submitting to Congress his recommendations upon these consolidations and eliminations?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I agree that the President was requested to submit to Congress a report on proposed consolidations and transfers. What I wish are the reasons on which his recommendations are based.

Mr. DOWELL. And is not this directly in conformity with the request of the Congress that these recommendations were made?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. He was asked to submit his recommendations and Congress has the privilege, of course, of considering them, which it is expected will be done next week.

Mr. DOWELL. And yet the gentleman states that these transfers are mere theoretical ideas and does not give this report any credence whatever, although it has been brought here at his own request.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I made my comments with reference to the General Land Office only. I have not considered the proposed transfer of other bureaus.

The interdependence of the General Land Office with the other bureaus of the Department of the Interior must be obvious to anyone who has given the subject any study.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

The General Land Office under the Department of the Interior is charged with the survey, administration, and disposal of the public domain under the multitude of public land laws enacted by Congress, and is a hub or central function of the Department of the Interior around which many of the activities of the other bureaus now in that department revolve and interlock. These duties are best summarized in section 453 of the Revised Statutes, which provides that the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall perform, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, all executive duties appertaining to the surveying and sale of the public lands of the United States, or in anywise respecting such public lands, and also such as relate to private claims of land, and the issuing of patents for all grants of land under the authority of the Government. To carry out these duties there is maintained—

First. In addition to the parent office in Washington, D. C., a field surveying service with headquarters in Denver, Colo., and 11 branch offices scattered throughout the public-land States, whose duty it is to survey and resurvey the public lands in order that they may be identified for disposition under the public land laws.

Second. Twenty-nine district land offices, throughout the States in which there is any substantial amount of vacant unappropriated public lands, and Alaska, for the receipt and primary disposal of applications under the various public land laws. These district offices have complete records showing the status of the public lands from which their availability may be determined by the public, and such offices have original jurisdiction in the disposition of all claims and applications presented.

Third. The Field Service, with division headquarters at Helena, Santa Fe, Salt Lake City, Portland, San Francisco, and Anchorage, under a chief located at the home office. The duties of this service involve the protection of the public lands and their resources from trespass, depredation, and fire, the safeguarding against unlawful acquisition of title to lands and cooperation with the public in public land matters. It also secures field data from which may be determined the feasibility of projects for the reclamation of public lands through private irrigation works, thus affording protection to the public as well as the Government.

Any study looking to the reorganization of the Federal Government, by which is proposed the transfer of that office to another department in order to place it in closer contact with other agencies or bureaus with which it has a common interest, must include consideration of the relationship and extent to which the activities of the General Land Office are interwoven with the vital activities of the Interior Department and its many bureaus and agencies.

With the exception of the agencies relating to Territories and possessions and the eleemosynary institutions, the General Land Office has close cooperation with all the sister bureaus and agencies of the Interior Department, namely, the Indian Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Geological Survey, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Education, and the Alaska Railroad, and also the office of the solicitor and the office of the Secretary.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE COOPERATION WITH THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Excepting the Secretary's office and the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, its closest relations are perhaps with the Geological Survey. This is due primarily to the fact that as the more valuable agricultural lands are disposed of, classification of the remaining lands subject to entry, especially under the enlarged or dry farming homestead laws and for entry under the stock raising homestead law has become necessary under existing statutes. During the last fiscal year there were 46,510 acres designated by the Geological Survey for the General Land Office as subject to entry under the enlarged homestead law and 1,112,822 acres designated as subject to entry under the stock raising homestead law.

But far beyond the classification of lands for entry is the service rendered the General Land Office by the Geological Survey in the administration of the mineral laws, especially since the advent of the mineral leasing act, under which our so-called fuel and fertilizer minerals are developed with due regard to their conservation. Mineral values, rather than agricultural values in the public domain are, therefore, becoming the dominant factor. As a general rule Congress, in providing for the disposal of the public lands under our homestead laws—except for stock-raising homestead purposes—railroad grants, State selections, and so forth, has limited such disposals to nonmineral lands. Hence an important burden is placed upon the General Land Office at the outset of satisfying itself as to the mineral or nonmineral character of the land. This classification is accomplished in a large part through the cooperation of the Geological Survey with its staff of technical experts. The work, being intradepartmental, is handled in the most informal manner with the least amount of correspondence and overhead, the records of each office being constantly informally examined by the other to facilitate final action and eliminate delay.

Since the laws of 1909 and 1910, providing for the separation of coal from the surface; the act of 1914, providing for the reservation of coal, oil, gas, phosphate, potash, and other minerals in disposing of the surface; and the mineral leasing act of February 25, 1920, and amendatory and supplemental legislation, our deposits of coal, oil, gas, potash, sodium, sulphur, and so forth, are developed under prospecting permits and leases on a royalty basis. Reports from the Geological Survey are secured in the case of each permit or lease application before action is taken thereon, and after permit or lease is issued the field operations thereunder are closely supervised by the Geological Survey to the end that the terms of the permit or lease are not violated and the district land offices may be enabled to collect the proper

royalties depending upon production. So as to oil and gas cases the survey is relied upon for information and reports as to whether the lands included in a prospecting permit are in a known producing oil or gas field; as to possible conflict with public water holes; as to the protection of a geologic structure from improper drilling and abandonment of wells under standard operating regulations, especially when release from liability under an outstanding bond is sought or application for extension is requested; as to the area selected for preferential lease following discovery under an outstanding prospecting permit; as to applications for relief from drilling requirements, for reduction of royalty, or for surrender or termination of a lease in whole or in part; as to possible drainage of vacant lands within known producing oil and gas fields, particularly where the drainage threatens naval oil reserves; as to applications for approval of operating agreements and unit plan of development under the provisions of the act of March 4, 1931, and as to the sale of royalty oil produced under oil and gas leases.

Similar cooperation is had in the administration of our leasing laws with reference to each of the other minerals disposable under said act.

Other activities of the General Land Office in which the work is brought into close contact with the Geological Survey are the classification of lands as to their value as public watering places, the classification of lands as to their power site possibilities, the suitability of lands for grazing and their carrying capacity, especially in authorized grazing districts, and the classification of lands involved in projects for withdrawals or reservations. Where applications are received for rights of way for reservoirs, ditches, canals, and so forth, utilizing water for irrigation purposes, Geological Survey reports as to the feasibility of the project, considering the water availability and manner of utilization, and so forth, are had and where rights of way for power transmission lines affecting Indian allotments are involved, the Geological Survey, instead of the Federal Power Commission, is the advisor to the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

In the matter of surveys the General Land Office executes, upon the request of the Geological Survey, surveys and resurveys under the rectangular system to define the limits of areas subject to mineral exploration, executes resurveys to identify the boundaries and facilitate the administration of oil and gas fields, conducts resurveys and subdivisional surveys in the coal regions to fix the boundaries between private holdings and those subject to lease and carries such boundaries into underground workings of mines. It cooperates in the adjustment of power site and public water-hole reserves to the lines of the public land surveys as executed and obtains interpretations of existing withdrawals in terms of such surveys.

By utilizing the services of the lithograph branch of the Geological Survey the General Land Office is able to secure photolithographic reproduction of the township plats of all public land surveys as they are accepted, and by this cooperation the necessary duplicate and triplicate copies of such plats for the official files of the district land offices and the Washington office are produced on drawing paper for official signature as original documents, thus saving the delay and expense of producing such plats at the hands of draftsmen.

Likewise, the official maps of the United States, prepared for the use of the Congress, and the State maps as compiled and published by the General Land Office, are reproduced in the lithograph branch of the Geological Survey.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE COOPERATION WITH THE INDIAN OFFICE

The contact and cooperation between the General Land Office and the Bureau of Indian Affairs touches every phase of the disposal of the public and reserved lands to and for the Indians, whether by allotment, trust patents, fee patents, or homesteads, and the disposition of ceded Indian lands. In brief the General Land Office is the agency through which the disposal of lands is made for the Indian Office. In the matter of surveys alone there is such an inseparable intermingling relationship in that the General Land Office executes the surveys of all lands within Indian reservations,

reestablishes the boundaries thereof, and resurveys the included townships for the purpose of defining and marking the boundaries of the individual Indian allotments and for the disposal of the ceded lands. In addition, special surveys within Indian reservations are executed upon request. Extensive resurveys of lands within Indian pueblos in New Mexico are executed by the General Land Office to define the boundaries thereof and to identify and exclude non-Indian claims in these areas.

Schedules of Indian allotments, when completed in the Indian Office, are handed to the General Land Office for the issuance of patents, whether in trust or in fee. This results in constant informal intercourse between the two bureaus. Indians on the public domain without tribal affiliations are permitted to make homestead entries as citizens of the United States under the general homestead act, or as Indians under the Indian homestead act, and under section 4 of the general allotting act. This work is handled primarily and finally by the General Land Office, but requires the closest cooperation with the Indian Office.

When surplus lands previously reserved for the benefit of the Indians are to be made subject to disposition under the public land laws, again there must be the closest cooperation between these sister bureaus, as the disposal of the lands and collection of moneys, for which an accounting is made to the Indian Office, is through the agency of the General Land Office. Likewise moneys from timber sales are collected by the General Land Office for the benefit of the Indians.

The General Land Office adjudicates and administers the Indian exchange laws, providing for the exchange of privately owned lands within Indian reservations for public lands. This, too, is a cooperative undertaking.

Since Congress has empowered many Indian tribes to sue in the Court of Claims for moneys claimed for lands primarily held by them, reports are required by the Department of Justice from both offices working in part in conjunction with each other as to the exact disposition by legal subdivisions of many millions of acres of former Indian lands. These reports are used as a basis for the adjudication of such claims by the Court of Claims. There are a number of such suits in the Indian Office and General Land Office awaiting investigation by both offices in the order filed.

Where applications for rights of way for canals, ditches, power transmission lines, reservoirs, etc., affect Indian lands, close contact with the records of the General Land Office is necessary.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE COOPERATION WITH THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The availability of lands for inclusion in Federal irrigation projects must be determined from the records of the General Land Office. Therefore at the outset the General Land Office plays an important part in reclamation work.

The public-land surveys executed by the General Land Office constitute the basis for the identification of the lands for withdrawal or disposition when reclaimed. Where economic irrigation in the establishment of farm units requires a further subdivision, such work when performed by the Reclamation Service is examined and approved by the General Land Office before it becomes the basis for title.

When lands are made available through a Federal reclamation project they are disposed of through the machinery of the General Land Office under the general homestead laws, subject to the provisions of the reclamation act. The adjudication of such homestead entries follows the usual procedure through the Land Department.

Applications under the mineral leasing act, rights of way acts, or other laws applicable to lands withdrawn for Federal reclamation purposes are adjudicated by the General Land Office in cooperation with the Reclamation Service.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE COOPERATION WITH THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

All public-land questions affecting national parks and national monuments are handled and adjudicated by the General Land Office in cooperation with the National Park Service. The boundaries of these parks and monuments, when not conformed to the rectangular system of surveys, are the subject of special surveys by the surveying service of the General Land Office. As in the case of lands needed

for reclamation, the availability of lands for park and monument purposes must be determined from the records of the General Land Office. The adjudication of conflicting rights, together with the exchange of privately owned lands within existing parks, are typical of the problems that confront the General Land Office in its cooperation with the National Park Service in the creation and furtherance of recreational areas. An illustration of the cooperation had between the General Land Office and the National Park Service might be indicated by the fact that many of the existing monuments and parks are the result of reports and recommendations of the field agents of the General Land Office in the first instance.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE COOPERATION WITH INTERIOR DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES IN ALASKA

The Governor of Alaska having been designated under authority of law the ex officio commissioner for the Department of the Interior in Alaska, all the activities of the General Land Office touching the survey, administration, or disposal of the public lands in that Territory are not only brought in close contact with the governor's office but with every other activity of the various bureaus of the Interior Department in Alaska whose work is coordinated through the governor as ex officio commissioner.

Touching the Alaska Railroad, all land questions are administered through the General Land Office. Withdrawals or reservations are made with reference to its records. The surveys of terminals and town sites along the road are made by its surveying service. The chief of its Alaskan field division is trustee, through whom all town lots are disposed of. The General Land Office is therefore an inseparable factor in the administration of this important activity.

SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Secretary of the Interior is charged by law with, among other things, the supervision of public business relating to the public lands, and the authority conferred by law upon the Commissioner of the General Land Office is made subject to the direction of the Secretary. Hence, in addition to the need for submitting to the Secretary important matters of policy and administration, there rests in him appellate and final authority over the acts of the commissioner in adjudicating all claims under the public land laws. As a part of the Secretary's office force, and for the purpose of handling particularly the legal phases of matters coming before the department from its several bureaus, there is maintained the office of the solicitor, with a staff of attorneys who are specialists in the subjects under the jurisdiction of the department.

Matters coming before the department from its several bureaus, whether by way of submission or on appeal, are carefully reviewed by some member or members of the solicitor's staff before being submitted to the Secretary, and also receive the review of the board of appeals, thus insuring harmony in decisions and policies and fixing precedents for the guidance of the bureaus.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office is authorized by law to decide upon principles of equity and justice, as recognized in courts of equity, all cases of suspended entries and to determine in what cases patent shall issue, and such judgments of the commissioner must have the approval of the Secretary. In adjudicating this class of cases the Secretary and the commissioner act as a board of equitable adjudication.

SUMMARY

From the foregoing it would appear that the above bureaus, together being intrusted with the administration of Federal resources of incalculable value, require a single supervisory officer to assure the essential coordination in, and unity of, administrative policy. The possible and even potential loss to the United States in its resources by divided control over the public lands is tremendous. The proposed change would, if effective, create a situation wherein the policies of the Land Office could not be accommodated to those of the other bureaus and vice versa unless the Secretaries of Agriculture and of the Interior could agree as to such policies.

Assuming the possibility of coordinating the decisions of the two Secretaries, the only alternative to the costly and cumbersome procedure of postal communication concerning every detail arising in connection with the administration of public lands, between the two departments, would be the creation of a record bureau duplicating the Land Office in the Interior Department, and a technical bureau duplicating the Geological Survey in the Department of Agriculture. Even this would not be satisfactory or efficient.

It would therefore appear that the proposed order transferring the Land Office to a department which did not also house the other referred to bureaus would be so contrary to the policy expressed by Congress in the above-quoted section 401, Title 4, Part II, of the so-called economy act, as to be invalid.

I, therefore, earnestly hope that Congress will express disapproval of the proposed transfer of the Bureau of the General Land Office from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture; and that this will be done before the expiration of the time within which Congress must act in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MAPES. I object. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment for the purpose of getting the floor. I do not expect to make any extended statement in regard to this reorganization matter at this time, but those of us who have made some study of reorganization of the departments of the Government realize how difficult it is to suggest anything that some one can not raise some objection to. If we are going to have any general reorganization of the departments of the Government we must make up our minds to accept some things, perhaps, that we individually would prefer not to have done.

The gentleman from Idaho says that the department was not heard on the particular matter to which he called attention. This matter of reorganization of the departments was a subject for discussion throughout the recent campaign. Everybody knew that the Director of the Budget was studying the matter and it is fair to assume that those who have knowledge of the situation were heard.

There are very few activities of the Government where you can get those engaged in the activity to consent to any transfer or consolidation, and the fact that they are opposed to consolidation is sometimes the best evidence that consolidation ought to be made.

I have been reading in the public prints that it was proposed to submit a resolution to the House opposing in toto all recommendations by the President in regard to consolidation of the departments.

If Congress passes such a resolution it is my judgment that it will be a long time before any general reorganization of the Government departments will ever be accomplished.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The gentleman speaks with a great deal of knowledge on this question. I would like to ask him if he knows of any good reason why the General Land Office, that to-day has charge of the public domain, should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture, whose activities are not along that line?

Mr. MAPES. I have made no special study of that activity, and as the gentleman knows the question came up this afternoon unexpectedly to me, but I assume that those responsible for the recommendation have a good reason for making it. I have made a study of different reorganization suggestions, and I know that it is difficult to propose the transfer of any activity without arousing the opposition of those engaged in that activity, the same as the gentleman from Idaho is objecting to this particular transfer.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I want to say to the gentleman that the committee has held hearings on the President's recommendations. We called the President's representative, Colonel Roop, before the committee to give us

information. We could get no information as to where any efficiency would be increased or where any economy would result from the consolidation. And, in answer to a question of mine, he stated that he agreed with me that it would be unwise for Congress at a time when another President was coming in to turn over the activities of bureaus to another department or new organization.

Mr. MAPES. Now, I can not yield further to the gentleman. I do not understand how any responsible official of this administration who made the recommendations to the President upon which the President's recommendations in turn were made to Congress, could go before the committee and make any such statement as that.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman will not deny that he made it, will he?

Mr. MAPES. Oh, no; I do not question that he made it. I have tried to get a copy of the hearings before the committee, but I have not been able to get it. I was told this morning that the hearings had been sent to the printer. Personally I would like to know why the Director of the Budget made any such statement as that after he has spent all summer in preparing his recommendations.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I happen to have a proof of the hearings in my office, and the gentleman is welcome to them.

Mr. MAPES. I shall be very glad to get them.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. I think the committee considering this has thus far heard only witnesses who are opposed to individual items in the recommendations and has had only one witness before it for just a brief time who favors in any way the proposition. The testimony has been limited entirely to those individuals.

Mr. MAPES. It has been largely an ex parte hearing, then, as I take it from the statement of the gentleman from Utah. The committee is apparently trying to find some justification for tearing down what has been done. Congress put it up to the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make these recommendations, and it is to be assumed that they went into the matter thoroughly before they made them.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I am quite sure that the gentleman has not taken into consideration as far as the Land Office is concerned, that a comprehensive study was made of the work done in the various divisions of the Department of the Interior by his former colleague, Mr. Cramton, and that the recommendations in the pamphlet prepared by him for the gentleman's use and mine and for the use of whomsoever else is willing to read it, are that the public lands of the United States is the general subject, and that the combination should be made around the public lands, and that the removal of the Land Office to the Department of Agriculture is wrong. The recommendation is made to take the Forest Service from the Department of Agriculture and put it with the rest of the activities having to do with the public land. Following that recommendation I introduced a resolution (H. Res. 332) and appeared in support of that resolution before the Committee on Expenditures.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask the gentleman from Colorado to take time in his own right if he desires to make a speech.

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. How much did the President estimate will be saved by these economies?

Mr. MAPES. The President, as I recollect it, said quite properly that the savings would depend upon the administrative officials, but that he was making recommendations

for the consolidations so that the administrative officials could make the economies. Nobody can tell what the economies will be until the administrative officials themselves figure it out. As a Member of Congress, the gentleman knows that he can not tell whether the Land Office or any other bureau in the Interior Department or any department of the Government is overmanned or not. The chief administrator of that department is the only man who can tell; and, if these different services are consolidated, then it will be up to the administrative officials to get rid of the unnecessary personnel, to do away with waste and duplication of service, and bring about such economies as can be brought about.

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. I should think that after some comprehensive study they would be able to make some sort of an estimate of what might be saved.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. I am a member of the committee, and I listened patiently to the Director of the Budget in the hearings before the committee in favor of the President's consolidation program; and from the testimony, the gentleman from Michigan can gather, when he reads it, that the Director of the Budget did not present any definite savings and that all he had was a general statement along the same line that Mr. BYRNS, the former chairman of the Democratic Economy Committee, had when he was going to save millions by the consolidation of the Army and Navy. It is all speculative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing for 20 minutes a matter that is extraneous to this bill. The recommendations of the President with reference to consolidation have nothing to do with the bill under consideration. We can discuss that at some appropriate time. There are many of us here who are anxious to get along with the consideration of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that he proceed for two minutes?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to that, but hereafter we ought to get on with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I think it is impossible for anyone to tell what the particular savings will be. Perhaps the amount of savings to be accomplished by any reorganization of the departments is greatly overestimated in the public mind, but the truth remains that the country and the Congress have been asking for a reorganization of the executive departments of the Government for years, and here is an opportunity to have that done. The President has made his recommendations after a careful study by the office of the Director of the Budget, and it seems to me that Congress is taking upon itself a very grave responsibility if it passes a resolution to undo what the President has done in this respect.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor, and withdraw my objection to the withdrawal of the pro forma amendment.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has apparently not seen that report of the History and Proper Functions of the Department of the Interior, by former Congressman Louis C. Cramton, which report has been circulated with all of the authority of the

Department of the Interior. His recommendations concerning the General Land Office are in the following language:

It has been suggested that the General Land Office be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Since agricultural development of these lands in the main is not to be expected, the work of the General Land Office does not tie into the statutory responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. There is only one bureau in the Department of Agriculture with which the General Land Office has any extensive contacts, that is the Forest Service; but the forest areas of the public domain under the General Land Office are relatively small as compared with the nonforest areas. In 1932 only 4,019 acres were entered under the timber and stone law. The General Land Office has as its major problems subjects with which the Forest Service has only incidental connection. Transfer of the General Land Office from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture would mean taking it away from a department efficiently administering it and in which most of its interbureau relationships are found, and transferring it to a department to whose statutory problem it is alien, in which its interbureau relationships generally are not found and which has already reached the limit of growth for most efficient departmental administration.

It is of the greatest importance to understand that as the administrator of the public domain, the Secretary of the Interior is the managing, coordinating, and appellate officer for five other bureaus or subjects, closely allied with the General Land Office, viz, the National Park Service, the Indian Office, the Reclamation Service, the Geological Survey, and Alaska.

History has taught us that the right of appeal for the redress of fancied or real wrongs is perhaps the greatest factor contributing to the tranquillity and happiness of a people and nation. The Department of the Interior has an enviable reputation throughout the public-land regions for the ease and fairness with which the humblest public-land claimant can take an appeal and secure a review of his cause. The reviews from or final authorization for the action of the six sections mentioned above are now given their primary consideration by a corps of attorneys in the Secretary's office, thus insuring harmonious action for all the sections or bureaus. It is important that this access to a common court of appeal be not disturbed.

At another portion of the report is found the following recommendation that the Forest Service be transferred back to the Department of the Interior:

FOREST SERVICE

Logically this service belongs in the general conservation and welfare department, the Department of the Interior. This is particularly true since it deals almost exclusively with a special category of public lands. It now administers over 160,000,000 acres of land, equal to nearly 8 per cent of the total land area in continental United States. A large percentage of this land is non-forest land, or lacking forests of real commercial value but, nevertheless, nearly one-fourth of the total timber in continental United States is now administered by this service. Included in this area are extensive mineral deposits which if they are acquired for development must be acquired under laws administered in the Interior Department by a competent staff of legal and scientific experts. The administration of these laws on lands otherwise managed by a unit in the Department of Agriculture means a double jurisdiction through which embarrassments have arisen in the past and are likely to arise in the future.

The principal value of the national forests aside from the timber that they contain is their value as grazing lands. Grazing within the forests now lies in the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Grazing on the public domain outside the forest boundaries is within the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. Two Government departments therefore are now engaged in the administration of a single Government resource. It is true that the management of the grazing within the forest reserves is more systematically and on the whole much more satisfactorily done than that on the public lands outside the forest reserves. This, however, is due to the availability of funds for the management of forest-reserve ranges and lack of legislation as to the general public domain and does not necessitate any radical reorganization, particularly since grazing is in large degree in each case an incidental use and not the primary objective.

Forest problems are in theory and in fact public-land problems and should be handled by that department of the Government which is charged with jurisdiction over other public-land problems. Closer contacts with the Geological Survey, the General Land Office, the National Park Service, and the Reclamation Service would mean better governmental administration as a whole.

Forestry policies were first urged and developed in the Department of the Interior and particularly under the leadership of the General Land Office * * *

INVOLVING THE FOREST SERVICE AND THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

The mining laws of the United States which are applicable to forest reservations, as well as to the public domain, are administered by the Interior Department. Under the joint regulations of August 5, 1915 (44 L. D. 360), of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, the Forest Service examines mineral entries and other claims within national forests. On request of the district forester, the chiefs of field division of the General Land Office assign mining engineers to assist in the investigation of mining

claims. Where it is found the law has not been complied with, the Forest Service brings proceedings in the district land offices of the Interior Department against the entries or claims and, if hearings are applied for, conducts the cases for the Government. The testimony of these hearings, however, is passed upon by the registers of the local land offices and appeals from their decisions lie to the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior. Thus it appears that while the Forest Service has no jurisdiction or administration over the minerals within its reservations, it maintains a corps of field men to examine and report upon mining claims within such reservations, which corps of field men is a duplication of that maintained by the General Land Office in connection with the administration of laws relating to the minerals on the public lands generally.

By the foregoing you will see that I am not alone in my contention that there was a mistake made when someone advised the President that he should order the transfer of the Land Office to the Department of Agriculture. Surely it will not be contended that the 49-page pamphlet by the "special attorney to the Secretary of the Interior," from which the citations were taken, was prepared and promulgated without authority. Nor that it is not entitled to the most respectful consideration.

To those who have been familiar with the many activities which have grown up in connection with the administration of the public lands of the United States it has been fully demonstrated that it is not merely convenient but necessary that all such should be found in one department, with one general administrative officer, whose subordinates' decision should be subject to review by a board of appeal whose scope covered the entire field of public-land matters, whether they were adjudication of titles to homestead, mineral, or Indian lands, the work of the cadastral, geological, or topographical surveys, reclamation projects, national parks, or Territorial lands.

I would like to have the time to-day to give you some of the history of the handling of the public lands. When the Department of the Interior was created in 1849, just 83 years ago, there were approximately 250,000,000 acres of public lands in the then States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida. To-day there are over 173,000,000 acres of vacant lands subject to all applicable public land laws, over 133,000,000 acres in the forest reserves, and almost 90,000,000 acres covered by various reservoirs, reclamation and miscellaneous withdrawn lands, from many of which a large revenue is collected by the agencies in the department and applied as required by the various statutes.

Most of these public lands are in the 11 Western States, Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, Montana, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, California, and Arizona. Their representation in the Congress is small. In the Seventy-third Congress there will be 22 Senators and 43 Representatives. The latter number is the exact number of the Representatives from the one great State of New York.

During the time since the Forest Service was transferred to the Department of Agriculture on February 1, 1905, the general policies of the handling of public lands have changed so that approximately 90,000,000 acres have been put in a classification of revenue producing, and much of the revenue derived therefrom has been applied to the reclamation of some of the lands within the 13,400,000 acres withdrawn for reclamation purposes.

No matter what the comment may be about the orders to transfer other departments of the Government, the conclusion is irresistible that the order to transfer the Land Office to the department was a mistake. I have no doubt that a careful consideration of the matter by anyone with sufficient knowledge of the functions incident to the handling of the public lands will result in the same conclusion.

The general subject is public lands, not agriculture. Each and every activity concerning the public lands ought to be under one supervision. But in any event, the present Land Office should not be divorced from the other public-land activities in the Department of the Interior, and since this one bureau is the only one ordered transferred to the Department of Agriculture, I submit that the disapproval thereof in the manner provided for by statute ought to be confirmed, and if in the future it should be deemed wise to

remove public-land matters from the Department of the Interior, then each and every bureau attending to any public-land matters ought to be consolidated in one group, the group kept intact and placed in that department which can best administer the whole subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eradicating tuberculosis: For investigating the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, and avian tuberculosis, for their control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the causes of the diseases, their modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, or State, Territory, or county authorities, \$5,945,360, of which \$1,145,360 shall be set aside for administrative and operating expenses and \$4,800,000 for the payment of indemnities: *Provided*, That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture it shall be necessary to condemn and destroy tuberculous or paratuberculous cattle, if such animals have been destroyed, condemned, or die after condemnation, he may, in his discretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere such sums as he shall determine to be necessary, within the limitations above provided, for the payment of indemnities, for the reimbursement of owners of such animals, in cooperation with such States, Territories, counties, or municipalities, as shall by law or by suitable action in keeping with its authority in the matter, and by rules and regulations adopted and enforced in pursuance thereof, provide inspection of tuberculous or paratuberculous cattle and for compensation to owners of cattle so condemned, but no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such cattle except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or municipality where condemnation of such cattle shall take place, nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal if at the time of inspection or test, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the animal shall be condemned; that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than \$25 for any grade animal or more than \$50 for any purebred animal, and that no payment shall be made unless the owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is there any overlapping of service between the Federal and State authorities on this matter of examining these cattle for eradication of tuberculosis; and if so, how is that controlled?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No. There is absolute cooperation. It can not be conducted in any other way, because the State pays a part of the cost of the condemned animals and the Federal Government pays part. It takes them both to constitute an operating force.

Mr. GOSS. Then there are no rules and regulations established by these Federal officials that in any way conflict with the work done in the States?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; the rules and regulations of the Federal officials and those of the States where they are operating are in accord.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eradicating hog cholera: For investigating the disease of hog cholera and related swine diseases, and for their control or eradication by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and other methods, either independently or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county authorities, \$420,000: *Provided*, That of said sum \$232,840 shall be available for expenditure in carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913 (U. S. C., title 21, secs. 151-158), regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals: *Provided further*, That of said sum \$27,700 shall be available for researches concerning the cause, modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention of these diseases.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Referring to this paragraph and two or three preceding paragraphs I find the same identical language used, and I want to call it to the attention of the chairman of the sub-

committee. For instance, in lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 26, there will be found these words:

A certain sum of money shall be available for researches concerning the cause, modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention of these diseases.

The language I have just read appears in the conclusion of three or four of these paragraphs. The point I am getting at is this: Is there ever to be an end of the research work? Is there ever to be an end concerning the study of the cause and modes of spread? It would seem that after a while, with all the research work we have had concerning these diseases about which we have known for years, finally we would reach the end of research work and we would reach the end of some of these developments. I am aware that there is need to carry on the work of extermination and such things; but that is a perfect illustration of how, once a bureau is established, it continues through all the years. Can the gentleman give any information to the committee as to whether or not, when these departments of research are once established, they ever do end their work?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It seems not. Of course, the gentleman knows how this identical language occurred. It was put in on the floor of the House by some Member who was concerned about some specific disease in his district and wanted it investigated. He would say, "This amendment does not increase the appropriation, and yet it provides that the investigation can be made."

That has been carried on because it was put in on the floor of the House from one Congress to another.

One of my criticisms of the Department of Agriculture—and the hearings at the sessions are full of my criticisms—is that when we start a research investigation upon a particular subject it seems that it never ends. At one time I had the chief of the scientific division begin a list of those that had ended and those that had not ended. That was one of my criticisms. When the next Congress meets, and when this subcommittee has more time, if I am fortunate enough to be alive and to be here, I expect to conduct a searching investigation upon each project and determine how long the scientists have been investigating it and what results they have accomplished, and whether any better results are hoped for. For instance, take the question of hog cholera. That has been investigated for 40 years.

Mr. KETCHAM. And tuberculosis in cattle.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, that has not been so long. I have no complaint of tuberculosis in cattle, but hog cholera has been investigated for 40 years. Over 20 years ago they found a serum that prevented hog cholera. They have made one progressive step since that time. They found a better serum and the serum does not cause any ill effect upon the hogs when injected into them, such as the old serum did. They held that out as an example of why these researches should be continued time on end. They say there is no end to science. That is true. But there ought to be an end to certain projects in science. I am going to conduct a searching investigation into these projects next year and determine what ones should be dropped, and drop the appropriation with it.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman then believes that a substantial saving could be made in checking over every one of these, where there is such broad authorization given for the expenditure of money?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I believe considerable savings can be made, and I intend to make them.

Mr. KETCHAM. As far as I am concerned, I wish the gentleman long life, great power, and more strength in that effort.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I notice this item includes the salary of chief of bureau and other personal service in the District of Columbia, \$129,975.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is an administrative item, is it not?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I was wondering how many chiefs of bureau there were. I notice that item several times.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There are about 23 bureaus and there are 23 chiefs.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional expenses in carrying out the provisions of the meat inspection act of June 30, 1906 (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 95), as amended by the act of March 4, 1907 (U. S. C., title 21, secs. 71-94), and as extended to equine meat by the act of July 24, 1919 (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 96), including the purchase of tags, labels, stamps, and certificates printed in course of manufacture, \$2,074,590.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he has put in any study on the permanent appropriations in connection with this Department of Agriculture appropriation bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; I am familiar with the permanent appropriations. However, this is not one of them.

Mr. GOSS. Well, it is in addition to one of \$3,000,000 carried for this same item, is it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. A long time ago, I think about 1906, Congressman Lorimer introduced and had passed through the House a permanent appropriation of \$3,000,000 for meat inspection. The amount of meat killed in the country from that period—1906—rose very rapidly. If we are to inspect meat at all, it is necessary to expand the work. The gentleman understands this is nearly all personal service. They required new inspectors. This committee has made additional supplementary appropriations to supply that need until the appropriation has reached about \$5,000,000. In my judgment, the amount above \$3,000,000 has no authorization in law. I gave serious consideration before my committee to striking it out. The appropriation has been made for years. They have built up a splendid inspection service. Over 350,000 carcasses are condemned each year, which contain germs, other bacteria, or infection injurious to human life. I was not willing to take the responsibility of turning loose upon my country a whole lot of poison meat for people to eat when they did not know it was poison. This is not an agricultural service, gentlemen. This is a service to the public. The Department of Agriculture gets less benefit than any other service. So the committee has recommended an appropriation for \$5,000,000—\$3,000,000 authorized and \$2,000,000 unauthorized.

Any man who wants to make the point of order and take the responsibility may do so; it is up to him.

Mr. GOSS. I would say to the gentleman that it is too late for the point of order, but I was interested in that point. Now, where can the Members of the House get that whole subject before them for their own scrutiny; will the gentleman tell us?

Mr. BUCHANAN. You mean by way of legislation?

Mr. GOSS. This whole question of meat inspection. There is a permanent appropriation of \$3,000,000 which the House can not even touch; that is permanent law. I am asking the gentleman how can we get that problem up in the House? The legislative committee would be the only one that could repeal the law. Is not that true?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, yes. The legislative committee is the only one that can bring in a bill to repeal the \$3,000,000 permanent appropriation, but the \$2,000,000 above the amount of the permanent appropriation could be stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. GOSS. I understand it can be done, but where can Members of the House get information on the whole question of meat inspection?

Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Texas whether the salary paid these inspectors under the permanent law is subject to the provisions of the economy act?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Surely they are.

Mr. GOSS. Salaries paid under authorization of permanent law?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly they are subject to the provision of the economy act.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They are veterinarians employed under civil service.

Mr. GOSS. The national-bank examiners are not subject to the economy act.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am pretty sure the veterinarians provided for in this bill are under civil service.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly, they are subject to it.

Mr. GOSS. Now, will the gentleman from Texas answer my other question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. What was it?

Mr. GOSS. The first one I asked.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will give the gentleman all the information on it he wants.

Mr. GOSS. I was informed yesterday that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], had just appointed a committee to investigate these items.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that if he will go to the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress, for which we make liberal provisions to render just such service, he can get the information he desires.

Mr. GOSS. What I am anxious to see is a consideration of all these appropriations under permanent authorization, amounting in all to some \$250,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the absence of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the chairman of the committee—I am sorry he is not here to answer the gentleman's inquiry—let me say it was stated in the press this morning that the chairman of that committee had appointed a select subcommittee from the full committee to make a general investigation and study of all these so-called permanent appropriations with a view of furnishing, I imagine, the exact information desired by the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GOSS. I hope the committee will go far enough to get some of these legislative committees to bring in a bill for the repeal of a great many of these permanent appropriations in the annual supply bills so that they may be considered on their merits each year in the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I assumed that was exactly the purpose the gentleman from Connecticut had in mind.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I desire simply to say a few words to have the RECORD show that there is not uniform opposition to this particular service and to this appropriation. It is a necessary service, one of the most necessary services in the Department of Agriculture. It is just as necessary and useful to the consumers as it is to the producers.

Mr. Chairman, if you will only go back to the days when Upton Sinclair wrote his *Jungle*, in the time of Roosevelt's administration, exposing the indecent, insanitary, shameful conditions existing in the stockyards, I believe that any Member would pause before even remotely suggesting that this meat inspection service should be discontinued.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In a moment. My genial friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] is going to ask what benefit the producer gets out of it.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the gentleman will permit, the producer gets his benefit, but this is a distinct service the greatest benefits of which go to the city consumers.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It goes to them to the extent that they are not compelled to eat the meat of tubercular cattle. It causes the breeding of good cattle in the gentleman's State, and we have learned from sad experience that without this inspection the most serious abuses would take place.

Mr. SIMMONS. This is an appropriation that can be justified not only by the producer but the consumer and the public generally.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All right; then we agree on that. I hope we will not let word go out that there is any thought in this House that the appropriation for the meat inspection service is unnecessary or that during this period of economic reorganization, unscrambling and rescrambling of departments, that this service is to be discontinued or in any way impaired.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. This is a service for the benefit, principally, of the packers.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; for the benefit of the consumers, primarily.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Well, it is a benefit the Government furnishes to the packers principally.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No.

Mr. ALLGOOD. If it is for the benefit of the packers, why not put a tax on the packers for this service?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is different; but I certainly would not want to put these inspectors under the direct control of the packers any more than I would want to put the bank examiners under the control of the National City Bank of my city.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I did not say anything about that. What I said was that the packers ought to pay for this service and not the Government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I believe that is simply a detail, and what we are primarily interested in—

Mr. ALLGOOD. It is not a detail; it is an economic consideration.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But what we are primarily interested in is that this very important service, which was brought about and developed as a result of scandalous conditions existing in the packing industry, shall continue unimpaired by the frenzy of economy.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I agree with the gentleman that it is a necessary inspection, but I do not think the Federal Government ought to pay for it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not care who pays for it, but I do care who controls this service, and it must be the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, threatens the livestock industry of the country, he may expend, in the city of Washington or elsewhere, any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for this purpose in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided*, That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, the payment by the United States Government for any animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That the sum of \$5,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$3,500,000, contained in the second deficiency appropriation act, fiscal year 1924, approved December 5, 1924, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease and other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, is hereby made available during the fiscal year 1934 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to control and eradicate the European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I see that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is now on the floor, and perhaps the gentleman would like to tell us about the matter that was referred to in the

press with respect to the appointment of a subcommittee to examine the permanent appropriations. Would the gentleman from Tennessee care to tell us about what he expects to do in that respect?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I regret I was not on the floor a moment ago. I had just been called out of the Chamber for a moment.

I may say to the gentleman that we had this object in view in naming this subcommittee. The gentleman himself has had a good deal to say in the past with reference to these permanent appropriations. Many of them have been on the statute books for many years. They were created, of course, by special legislation. They occur more particularly in the Department of Agriculture, in the Department of the Interior, in the Treasury Department, and in the War Department. There are also permanent appropriations in some of the other departments.

Of course, these permanent appropriations are never examined, or rarely so, by the subcommittee, because they are not included in the estimates, and they go along from year to year as a matter of course in pursuance of the legislation which was passed creating them. Some of them, like the debt-retirement appropriation, interest on the public debt, and possibly others that I might allude to, doubtless ought to be retained as permanent appropriations. The appropriations to which I have referred, as the gentleman knows, are dependent upon various contingencies, such as the amount of the public debt and its increase or decrease, as the case may be.

When the subcommittee was appointed we had in mind, now that many of the appropriations are getting behind us, that the subcommittee would take this general subject under consideration and would conduct an inquiry without delay as to all of these permanent and specific appropriations.

I may say that exclusive of interest on public debts and the debt-retirement appropriation these appropriations amount to about \$140,000,000, and if, upon investigation, they find any of them can be eliminated, they will, of course, so recommend. If they find they can be reduced, they will so recommend; but in any event I hope the committee will report and recommend that they be transferred to live and active appropriations, so that hereafter it will be necessary for the Director of the Budget to make his estimates for whatever is necessary in these appropriations just as he does with respect to other appropriations, and thus enable the committee and the Congress to secure information from year to year as to just what is being done and how much is being expended, and whether or not it is being economically expended.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. Outside of interest on public debts and the sinking-fund appropriation, I understood the gentleman to say that these appropriations amount to about \$140,000,000?

Mr. BYRNS. That is my recollection.

Mr. GARNER. Under the Holman rule, an amendment to this bill or to any other appropriation bill repealing any of these laws would be in order, because it would reduce expenditures; is not that correct?

Mr. BYRNS. I think it would have to show on the face of the amendment that it was a reduction of the total expenditure.

Mr. GARNER. Undoubtedly that would be shown on its face, because the gentleman's statement is that these appropriations amount to \$140,000,000, and if we repeal them that would reduce the appropriations.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And this would cause the Committee on Appropriations in the next Congress to make an entire survey of the permanent appropriations, such as the gentleman suggests now should be done, and there would be no need of any legislation except on amendments to the appropriation bill itself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. I had in mind that before the step to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] refers was undertaken, the subcommittee could make an exhaustive and intelligent inquiry, and it ought not to take them very long to gather all the facts. They would have the representatives of the various appropriations appear and testify, and could do this in an intelligent way and not repeal appropriations that ought to be carried along. But we could put these things into effect, either as the gentleman suggests or in the deficiency bill under a rule, if necessary, or, as the gentleman suggests, it may be done under the present rule.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield in order that I may ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?

Mr. BYRNS. Let me say one thing more. I have no information with reference to permanent appropriations except in a general way any more than any other Member of the House, because I have not fully investigated them; but I think the main advantage to be gained is the fact that it will give the committee of Congress an opportunity to investigate year by year and learn what is being done and how the money is spent.

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. I did not understand the question of the Speaker. Did he ask whether under the Holman rule you could repeal the general law?

Mr. BYRNS. I will let the gentleman from Texas answer for himself.

Mr. GARNER. You can cut any appropriation under the Holman rule if it reduces the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. SNELL. I can not agree that you can repeal the general law by the Holman rule.

Mr. GARNER. I did not say so.

Mr. SNELL. You can limit or cut an appropriation in this bill under the Holman rule.

Mr. GARNER. Any appropriation carried in the bill you can reduce if it shows on its face it is a reduction under the Holman rule.

Mr. SNELL. But you can not repeal the general law under this bill.

Mr. BYRNS. The difficulty is that there are no permanent appropriations carried in this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Yes; some.

Mr. BYRNS. I am talking about the permanent appropriations.

Mr. GOSS. Yes. I want to call attention to one other thing I have found in the investigation of permanent appropriations. I find that there are many permanent appropriations in the organic law that are not active. I might refer to something like this: The Treasury Department, when it sells a Coast Guard boat, can reappropriate that money for the purchase of a new vessel. I understand permanent appropriations are not mentioned in the bill or report providing they are not recommended in 1934 or carried in 1933 or in 1932.

So I would like to suggest an investigation of the whole range, whether they are active or inactive.

Mr. BYRNS. The proposed subcommittee is going into the whole question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman says that the permanent appropriations are not mentioned in the report. They are carried at the close of the report.

Mr. GOSS. I was speaking of the permanent appropriations that are inactive.

Mr. SIMMONS. Those that constitute a revolving fund. They ought to be; the Members of Congress ought to have a chance to pass on them.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman from Connecticut yield to me to ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Is it not true that the permanent appropriations—appropriations under the present law—are only about 10 per cent of the amounts required to meet the debt service under existing conditions—\$1,200,000,000?

Mr. GOSS. One billion four hundred million dollars is included in the report of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BYRNS. That includes interest on the sinking fund.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee, in the time of the gentleman from Connecticut, this question: Surely, in this investigation looking toward possible economy in these so-called appropriations, under mandatory, permanent legislation, the gentleman does not want the country to get the idea that the amounts now appropriated for interest charges on the public debt are so rigid that they can not be reduced?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no. On the contrary, I think I was careful to say that they may be increased or decreased.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Or lowered, according to the interest rate.

Mr. BYRNS. Absolutely.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Under a proper, conscientious refunding system, looking to the best interests of the country, surely at this time the outstanding indebtedness of the country could be refunded on a 3 per cent basis?

Mr. BYRNS. I would hope so. I do not know just what the interest would be, but I think that the gentleman is nearer correct than incorrect in that statement.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Practically every appropriation has been reduced within the last two or three years outside of these permanent appropriations. Would it be within the jurisdiction of the committee of the gentleman from Tennessee to bring in a blanket resolution reducing all appropriations a given per cent, say 10 per cent or 15 per cent, or whatever per cent the gentleman's committee thinks advisable, so that all appropriations of the Government, regardless of whether they are permanent or temporary, would likewise suffer a reduction at this time?

Mr. BYRNS. Inasmuch as these permanent and specific appropriations are made as a result of legislation, I am not so certain that a resolution of that kind would be in order, but the whole object of this subcommittee is to investigate the whole subject from every angle and then to make recommendations to the House so that if legislation is necessary, the proper committee may be so advised, and, if the House prefers a rule, it can adopt that policy; but in any event the idea will be to reduce those appropriations where they can be reduced and to get some information about how they are being expended when they can not be reduced.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman realizes the difficulty in reference to changing legislation. For instance, he will recall his experience with the Economy Committee when a suggestion was made that the committee was going to reduce a certain appropriation. The gentleman knows himself that in one morning he received 1,500 telegrams in protest, instigated by Government agents.

Mr. BYRNS. I think the gentleman is rather modest in his estimate of the number that all of us received.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I received about 500, and I thought the gentleman from Tennessee received 1,500.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] undoubtedly will wield great influence in the next Congress and the next administration, and may I suggest to him that he use that influence to have the proper authorities carefully consider the law passed in 1789 defining the qualifications and disqualifications of the Secretary of the Treasury. Those old boys back in the early days knew what they were doing a great deal better than we do, because to-day we seem to be overimpressed if we have a Secretary of the Treasury of whom it can be said that he is a multi-

millionaire. If we can get a man for Secretary of the Treasury of the type defined in the original act, I think we will be able to much more properly refund our national debt at a low rate of interest, thereby saving hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. GOSS. I understand the gentleman is probably going to be willing to support a resolution of some kind that might repeal all of these permanent appropriations, so that they may come before the House each year?

Mr. BYRNS. That is the whole object of the investigation.

Mr. GOSS. And the gentleman thinks that will be done?

Mr. BYRNS. I think so, but I would not say in every instance; but I think where it is not done, the committee will be able to present a very good reason why it should not be done.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman think that we ought to repeal the authority to pay the interest on the public debt and provide for the sinking fund?

Mr. GOSS. I think we ought to repeal every one of the permanent appropriations and then see to it that the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations bring in each supply bill the amount necessary, whatever that may be, to take the place of the permanent appropriation, so that the matter would come before the House for attention, and so that we might have it before us each year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. I assume that the gentleman from Connecticut realizes it would be pretty difficult just at the present time to estimate the amount that will be required to pay the interest on the public debt.

Mr. GOSS. That is perfectly true.

Mr. HASTINGS. For that is changing both as to amount and as to rate of interest. All of the others perhaps could be taken care of much more easily than the one providing for interest on the public debt and the sinking fund.

Mr. GOSS. I admit to the gentleman that that is a special instance.

Mr. HASTINGS. I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut. I think all of the rest of them ought to be repealed.

Mr. GOSS. And brought in here on the annual supply bills.

Mr. HASTINGS. I agree with the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arlington Farm: For continuing the necessary improvements to establish and maintain a general experiment farm and agricultural station on the Arlington estate, in the State of Virginia, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved April 18, 1900 (31 Stat. pp. 135, 136), \$51,545: *Provided*, That the limitations in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. It seems to me that this farm located out here on the Arlington estate, where the land is not particularly suitable for this sort of thing, should be abandoned and that we ought to stop continuing the necessary improvements to establish and maintain a general experimental farm at that place, and in that way save \$51,545.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Not alone is agricultural experiment work carried on there but I know that one of the chemical laboratories which is doing a great deal of very valuable work and much test work is being conducted there, wholly independent of the sort of work the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. TABER. This is for continuing the necessary improvements. That is all this appropriation is for. Then it

provides later on that the limitations in this act, as to cost of farm buildings, shall not apply to this paragraph.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The members of this committee know that this Arlington Farm is the very basis of practically all the fundamental experiments in research in the Bureau of Plant Industry; and if that is stricken out, we might just as well strike out the Bureau of Plant Industry. It is the very basis of all operations. I am surprised at my colleague offering an amendment to strike it out.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TABER. This appropriation provides for continuing the necessary improvements. It is not a maintenance appropriation at all. I am surprised that the chairman of the subcommittee is confused on the subject.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Has the gentleman overlooked the word "maintain"?

Mr. TABER. No; I have not. It reads:

For continuing the necessary improvements to establish and maintain.

It does not read that the money we are appropriating here is to maintain. It says:

For continuing the necessary improvements.

That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 13, noes 24.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barberry eradication: For the eradication of the common barberry and for applying such other methods of eradication and control of cereal rusts as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including the payment of such expenses and the employment of such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$180,722: *Provided*, That \$75,000 of this amount shall be available for expenditure only when an equal amount shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured or destroyed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have a little report about the progress of barberry eradication. We have been at the job now for 10 or 15 or 20 years, and very considerable sums of money have been expended. I do not know that we have had a report lately as to the progress that has been made in connection with it or whether there are any indications that we shall finally come to the end of this recurring appropriation carrying, as it does, a little over \$250,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. According to the information given the committee, the results from the expenditure of that money in destroying the barberry bush and preventing spring rust on wheat are very gratifying. Over a 5-year period there were 89,333,000 bushels of wheat destroyed prior to our operations. Since then there has been an average of 17,000,000 bushels, in the recent 5-year period, destroyed annually by spring rust on wheat. So that if the statement of the department is correct in these matters, we are amply justified in continuing this work until it is completed. When I say "completed" I do not mean forever eradicated from the United States, because I think that is impossible, but I mean eradicating it from the principal wheat-producing areas. There is no question that if we destroy barberry bushes in those areas, we will not have spring rust on wheat.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is the gentleman prepared to give the committee at this time any information as to the extent to which that program has been carried out and how much longer may we expect to make this appropriation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We are gradually reducing it. Three hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars was appro-

priated in 1932. In this bill we are recommending \$180,000, a considerable reduction. The local communities are now interested. The Boy Scouts and boys' and girls' corn clubs and such organizations are interested now in eradicating barberry bushes, and they are accomplishing a great deal with very little money.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is the appropriation made by the Federal Government conditioned upon cooperation by the various States?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Seventy-five thousand dollars of it.

Mr. KETCHAM. Of course, if the States desire this work, by appropriating a corresponding amount, then they may ask the Federal Government to come into their State and spend a portion, up to \$75,000 for this work?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Seventy-five thousand of it is to be matched. That is all.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of a series of appropriations in this bill and other bills coming before the Congress, which illustrates the only practical way in which any large, substantial reduction in the expenses of the Federal Government can be obtained, namely, by the total elimination of such appropriations.

What does this appropriation do? It sets aside \$180,000 for barberry eradication, and then goes on and provides that \$75,000 of this amount shall be available only when somebody else contributes \$75,000. I do not know whether that is a bait for receiving the \$75,000 or whether it is intended as an inducement to obtain appropriations and contributions from others; but in these times, when we are trying to economize, I repeat, the only way we can do it is by eliminating expenditures of a character which should not necessarily be incurred by the Federal Government.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman explain to the House what the purpose of this eradication is, what it does, and what it accomplishes, or does not the gentleman know anything about it?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Oh, yes, I do. It accomplishes just exactly what the States themselves could accomplish in their own territories. I dare say there is no territory subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Government of the United States where this appropriation has any value.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield again for a suggestion?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. Apparently the gentleman entirely overlooks—and I am not surprised, because the gentleman may not be conversant with the subject—the gentleman entirely overlooks the fact that barberries present a danger which is not limited to a local area or to a State but is entirely international and interstate in character as well as local. In fact, the barberry bush is not even native to this country but was imported into the United States, and the presence of it in one State is as dangerous to the wheat producers of another State as if the plant were locally there.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think I shall pass over the gentleman's suggestion that I do not know anything about the subject. I have been here some years, and I have known something about the appropriations that have been made by Congress. I repeat that this is a subject matter for local regulation, for local expenditure, and entirely for local administration.

If we need any of it in the District of Columbia—I know there is a reference in the paragraph to the city of Washington, which, of course, is improper, there being no such thing, the city of Washington being only a part of the District of Columbia, and probably that reference is by way of inducement—but if there is such a thing necessary for the District of Columbia, let the Federal Government, as being responsible for the government of the District of Columbia, make separate provision for that. This is the sort of thing which we are doing all over the United States

in the States, which, in my opinion—and I think my opinion is justified—is a matter of local regulation and local jurisdiction.

Now, of course, if we shall continue this plan, if we shall continue this work of the Federal Government assisting the States, contributing to the States, inducing the States and local organizations to contribute, to match the contributions of the Federal Government—if we are to continue this general plan, we can never hope for any substantial reduction in the expenditures of the Federal administration. I am speaking of the Federal administration as being something entirely separate from local administrations. I am speaking of the particular functions of the Federal Government as distinguished from the functions of the State and local governments; and I believe this is a good place to start. All through this bill there are places to start the elimination of non-Federal activities and expenditures. I shall not take up the time of the committee to make futile efforts upon all of these proposals, but I offer this amendment in all earnestness and hope it will be adopted. Of course, to be consistent, we should follow up this action with similar elimination of other like activities. I think the policy of making Federal appropriations dependent or conditional upon contributions from other sources is particularly obnoxious and unwise. If the object is Federal, let us handle it; if it is not, let the responsibility and the burden of expense rest where it belongs.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I hope the distinguished gentleman from Illinois did not take any offense at the statement I made where I indicated that possibly he did not know anything about the details of this work. Surely, I did not mean to imply that there is any Member of the House who knows more about general legislation than does he, and I hold him in high regard; but I do think that it is a fair inference from what he has said that he has not given his usual close attention and study to this particular item.

Here is an appropriation that is of interest not to one State but to some 13 or 14 States throughout the country.

At the very time when food was needed the most during the World War, the black-stem rust did a tremendous damage, amounting in fact to almost a couple of hundreds of millions of dollars in one season. The Nation was interested then; it is interested now. Of course, the producers of wheat have a special interest.

Now, the scientists of the country have satisfactorily established the fact that the barberry bush is the host of the black-rust spore, and that the black-rust spore, whatever it is called, can not live through the winter in northern sections of the United States except as protected by the barberry bush. It acts as a host to the spore. The barberry bush was brought here from Europe. It has been used as an ornamental shrub in almost every State of the Union. The difficulty is that, although the barberry may be destroyed in the spring-wheat area, that is not sufficient for the protection of the wheat growers in that section, for these spores, according to the testimony that has been submitted from year to year, and according to the investigations that have been made, are carried hundreds of miles, if not thousands of miles, as claimed by some. In any event, the spores have been found, if I remember correctly, as high as 5,000 feet above ground by airplanes making the investigations. This gives you an idea of the hazard of infestation over wide areas.

So the people of one State raising wheat can not solve the problem themselves, for they could eliminate all the barberry bushes within the borders thereof and still be confronted with practically the same hazards. In other words, Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana are just as much interested in having these bushes removed from Wisconsin and Michigan, States which do not produce much wheat, as they are in having them eliminated from within their own borders. The spores do not recognize artificial boundaries.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Also, these little bugs can not recognize a State line and remain within a State, can they?

Mr. BURTNESS. Of course they do not. None of the eradication work or the control work done by the Department of Agriculture along various lines pertaining to crops or farm products is more of a distinct Federal function than this. Why should people in Wisconsin destroy their barberry bushes in large stretches of land where no grain is raised when very little wheat is grown in the whole State?

I am surprised to hear the suggestion that the fact the people of the Northwest have passed the hat around and have been raising \$75,000 each year furnishes an argument why the Federal Government should step out of the picture. Of course we are interested. We are doing our part. The fact is that there is no appropriation in this entire bill which has suffered so much from reductions in recent years as this particular item for barberry eradication. As I recall it, this appropriation was reduced \$175,000 or thereabouts for the current year. The appropriation used to be at least \$375,000 in round figures, and that only two years ago. To-day it is proposed at less than half that amount—\$180,722. We are not complaining. We know that we must graciously accept our part in the economy program, but when an appropriation is reduced more than 50 per cent of what it was two years ago, and when it is rendering a real service to the people in a great many States, involving one of the necessary foods of the Nation to-day produced at a loss to the farmer, surely very little sympathy will be given to any argument in favor of eliminating it entirely.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we would better the condition of the wheat farmer by appropriating some money to disseminate this disease that comes from these bushes throughout the wheat district, so we will cut down the production of wheat. The best friend the cotton farmer ever had was the boll weevil. We did not have sense enough to know it, and we of the South spent millions of dollars of our own hard-earned money and then came to Congress and asked for appropriations to fight the boll weevil. As a result we now have a 2-year supply of cotton and can not sell it and can hardly give it away. The Red Cross has been called upon to dispense it throughout the country. The same thing is true of the wheat farmers. They have an enormous surplus that they can not sell. It is my opinion that the wheat farmers would prefer asking for an appropriation to propagate this disease rather than ask for an appropriation to help exterminate it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Would the gentleman say that cooties are healthful for the Army? The same principle is involved.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for one minute.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my good friends from the Northwest that I shall just as cheerfully vote to eliminate a lot of other appropriations of this character. It is not my purpose to particularly attack the appropriations for barberry eradication. This bill is full of appropriations of this kind. The point I want to make is that if we are going to have any large reduction of expenditures we can get this only by confining the Federal Government to the things which are Federal in their nature and in their origin. We have had demonstrated here to-day just what happens the moment we try to effect any economy in any of these appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHINDBLOM) there were—ayes 14, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Botany: For investigation, improvement, and utilization of wild plants and grazing lands, and for determining the distribution of weeds and means of their control, \$39,113.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question.

While I appreciate the fact it is pretty hard to cut out any kind of appropriation, it does seem to me that in these times when it is pretty hard to get money it would be perfectly proper to cut down to a certain extent the making of investigations and general experiments. I have noticed that where we once start a new investigation it is continued for all time, or it is very seldom that one is entirely done away with or stopped. From all the information I can get from the hearings, it seems to me here is one place where we could cut down by a reasonable amount without doing any specific harm to anybody or to any part of the country. I notice this appropriation has only been cut under the appropriation for last year by the amount taken out on account of the furlough system. Is there any real reason why we could not start on these investigations and cut them 50 per cent for the next year, or at least some amount to show we are at least trying to save money?

Mr. BUCHANAN. On a fundamental investigation like this they have a regular corps of scientists working on fundamental principles upon which they base all other investigations; and when you cut them down, you are cutting out some of the fundamental work and compelling the discharge of a specialist who is not qualified for anything else.

As the gentleman knows, this is a small bill carrying a rather small appropriation, and one serious question that has been in my mind in connection with this bill is whether we are now to undertake to cut these appropriations that result in the discharge of employees. We spend about \$1,000,000,000—

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman will permit right there, the gentleman would not want to go on record as saying that he is making these appropriations simply for the purpose of keeping employees?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Absolutely not.

Mr. SNELL. That is practically what the gentleman's statement was.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; it was not. I said these are fundamental investigations that these employees are engaged upon and that the results of these investigations are essential for other investigations along more detailed lines of agricultural research.

Mr. SNELL. There is nothing in the hearings to show there is anything necessary or essential about this work whatever.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It just happened that was not developed at this time. The gentleman must remember that my committee has been working on these appropriations so long, and especially myself, that we are familiar generally with all the activities of these scientific bureaus.

Mr. SNELL. Does it not seem to be appropriate in these hard times to cut out a little of the experimental work? As I view this bill, there is not any cutting out of the experimental work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, yes; we have cut some of the research work.

Mr. SNELL. In very few places—you have cut out that which was necessary on account of the furlough plan.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman will understand that the Budget comes up here, and we have cut below the Budget, and in not a single instance have we allowed an item increasing the Budget.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman, and I compliment him for it, but in the last resort we are responsible for the appropriations; and if there is one place, in my judgment, where we can cut down these appropriations, it is on the general-investigation subjects, from which we can not see any definite returns from year to year.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let me say to my friend and colleague that the research items in this bill ought to be the last items cut. When you strike out the research investigations and

demonstrations from the Agricultural Department bill, you might as well abolish the Agricultural Department, because the farmers of the country can do the rest themselves.

The organic act establishing the Department of Agriculture provides for scientific investigations, scientific information, and the whole department is based on investigation and research; and when you unduly curtail that, you might as well abolish the department.

Mr. SNELL. I admit that you do not want to abolish all of it, but I take the position that it is not necessary to continue forever every single investigation that is carried in this bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I agree to that.

Mr. SNELL. But you are not cutting any of them in this bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, yes, we are.

Mr. SNELL. For instance, on page 36:

Genetics and biophysics: For biophysical investigations in connection with the various lines of work herein authorized, \$33,617.

The hearings show that Mr. Taylor said that he could not justify the appropriation, and said it was largely a matter of guesswork. He was experimenting with the effect of electricity on plants. Does the gentleman mean to say that he is going to continue that investigation forever?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have not said so.

Mr. SNELL. It has been continued for some time, and it seems to me we ought to cut 50 per cent out of these appropriations if the gentleman means what he says when he says that he wants to cut them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to my colleague that if he wants to procure economy in Government, he can do so by reducing by 10 per cent every salary of every Government employee, including Congressmen, the pensions of every pensioner of every war, and the retirement pay of every Army and Navy officer, and save the taxpayers about \$300,000,000. Such reductions to continue during this depression. The patriotism of every class reduced would sustain the reduction.

Mr. SNELL. As far as I am concerned, the gentleman can not go too far to suit me. Why not reduce the appropriations we have before us and not something in the air? Here is a definite proposition before us, why should not it be cut 50 per cent?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This appropriation of \$39,000 has been reduced.

Mr. SNELL. Only \$2,000 from last year.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And \$17,000 the year before.

Mr. SNELL. But it is only \$2,000 less than the appropriation last year, and that is just the amount the furlough system cut out of the pay roll.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This goes to a fundamental investigation and research in agriculture.

Mr. SNELL. There is nothing fundamental about this research as far as agriculture is concerned, according to the hearings.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The hearings might not have been developed at this session, but the matter was developed in the past. We do not have to develop the same hearings and the same items every Congress and have a reprinting of them and have the printing bill increased. When we know a thing, we know it.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman can not tell me anything definitely good that comes out of this investigation. What is the line of work?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Botany.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; but what part? The dissemination of information about wild weeds and the means of their control?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of all plant life.

Mr. SNELL. And as to the others that I called attention to, the gentleman said yes, that he did not see what it amounted to, practically, and Doctor Taylor said it was largely guesswork.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am curious to know what the gentleman's fundamental attitude is here on questions of economy. The gentleman is now referring to something that might have occurred before the committee with reference to the hearings. I assume the gentleman is taking the position that in order to justify appropriations there ought to be some evidence before the committee or some recommendation from the Budget to support them.

Mr. SNELL. To a certain extent that is true, but I shall try to explain once more that in the final analysis we are responsible for these appropriations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And only a day or two ago—

Mr. SNELL. Oh, wait; the gentleman asked me a question, and I want to answer it. I take the position on the matter of general investigations and experimentation that this is a good time to cut a part of it out. I will go half way with the gentleman, but it seems to me in the condition in which we find ourselves economically we could cut part of it and do whatever is necessary fundamentally for agriculture. That is my position.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The reason I made inquiry as to the gentleman's basic attitude on these things is that he is now contending for something that is real economy, according to the gentleman's attitude, which might be in the teeth of the recommendation of the Budget, but only a few days ago—

Mr. SNELL. Oh, the gentleman has not always followed the recommendations of the Budget, nor have any of the rest of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the leader of his party, ought to attempt to be consistent in these matters of economy, and that he ought to have some basic principles on which to proceed. Just two or three days ago he certainly departed from that principle on a naked proposition that came up here appropriating \$460,000 without a recommendation from the Budget.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, I admit that the gentleman and his party have never been friendly to Howard University, and that we always have.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is that the best the gentleman can say?

Mr. SNELL. The Federal Budget has recommended that for about six or seven years.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But not this year.

Mr. SNELL. We have built the buildings, and are we not going to warm them?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman thinks he is consistent in that attitude, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. SNELL. As far as that is concerned, I am, and I have said also that now is the proper time to begin to cut down general investigations, and I stand on that, and you have not said a thing in your hearings, nor at any time, to justify continuing them.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. I do not know as to the particular item, but I do know that this bill in several items has cut down the appropriation for research work.

Mr. SNELL. In the two or three that I have had a chance to look at they have cut down the amount reduced in salaries because of the furloughs.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. With respect to the castigation by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is it not a fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DE PRIEST] presented to the House in debate facts and reports of responsible Government officials justifying the heating plant for Howard

University, while in the case now before us nobody has presented such facts?

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman is correct, but we better confine ourselves to the matter now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I did not want to inject any extraneous matter into this debate, but in view of what has been said, and the general attitude of my good friend, the minority leader, with reference to these appropriations, which are made for the benefit of research in the aid of agriculture in the gentleman's own State as well as every other State in the Union, and in view of his attitude with respect to further reductions in the Budget estimates, when they have already been cut to some extent by the committee, I am extremely surprised that the gentleman shows such great desire and zeal for economy to-day, when on yesterday, as leader of the minority he surrendered his leadership and yielded to a plea for \$460,000 to be devoted out of the people's Treasury, when a Republican President had said that it was not necessary for next year, and when there was not a line of information or testimony before the committee or before the House showing that it was necessary, or that the amount voted was required. The gentleman talks about the Democratic Party and its position with reference to Howard University. I say to the gentleman that in the bill which was passed yesterday there was carried an additional appropriation of over \$632,000 for construction work and the erection of buildings at Howard University.

The gentleman, who is a business man and so accredited in this House, I am sure does not want to stand before the country and say that in his judgment as a business man and as a great economist it will require \$460,000 to erect a little central heating plant down here for Howard University. Yet the gentleman who now pleads for economy, when appropriations are for the benefit of the farmer and the agricultural interests of this country, yesterday, I repeat, voted \$460,000 out of the people's Treasury when his own President, a Republican President, if you please, and his Director of the Budget, a Republican Director of the Budget, after a second investigation declared to the committee and to the Congress and the country that it was not necessary, and there was not a line of testimony to justify it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman said he deplored the fact that extraneous matters were brought in. The gentleman knows that the gentleman from New York did not bring it in, but it was brought in by a gentleman from his own side of the House.

Mr. BYRNS. That is true.

Mr. SNELL. Furthermore, that appropriation was recommended twice, and evidence was produced by the Bureau of the Budget, and so forth, that the expense was justified.

Mr. BYRNS. Permit me to answer that. It is true the question was brought up on this side, and I think it was brought up in a very timely and necessary way.

Mr. SNELL. Then the gentleman should not deplore the fact that it was brought up.

Mr. BYRNS. Because the gentleman to-day was attempting to appear in the rôle of a great economist at the expense of the agricultural interests of the country, and proposing to cut the estimate of the Republican President, submitted in the interest of agriculture, 50 per cent, while on yesterday the gentleman overrode the same President and ignored the fact that there was no testimony to justify the appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman said I was trying to reduce the efficiency of the Department of Agriculture. This is the answer that Doctor Taylor gave on one of these experiments:

It is altogether a guess what may come out of it. We have been able to correct some theories that appeared rather plausible, and through the radiation of current from wires overhead the plant growth could be materially stimulated—

And so forth.

We have not found this true by the tests here, even when using the equipment named.

Does the gentleman think that by reducing in part an appropriation for that kind of foolishness it is really doing anything to injure the interests of agriculture? Now, be honest about it.

Mr. BYRNS. Undoubtedly, in view of the statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], relative to the purpose for which the Department of Agriculture was created, I think the interest of agriculture would be injured. The President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture, who belong to the Republican Party, felt it was necessary. Surely they would not come here and ask the gentleman to vote for a pitiful little sum of \$39,000 for that work unless it was required. If the gentleman feels to-day that they were mistaken, of course, it is his privilege to vote against the appropriation; but I come back to this proposition: If the gentleman is so economical to-day with reference to \$39,000 for the benefit of the farmers, why did not the gentleman show the same economy yesterday when there was a \$460,000 appropriation under consideration?

Mr. SNELL. That rather got under the gentleman's skin, did it not? The gentlemen on that side can not get over it.

Mr. BYRNS. But I want the gentleman to be consistent, and I hope, in view of his remarks to-day, that he will stand by the Committee on Appropriations henceforth, and in these larger bills that are coming, we will find the gentleman not doing as he did yesterday, voting to override the committee, but standing with all of his power and influence behind the committee in its efforts to bring about economy.

Mr. SNELL. I was simply following the answer to the question which the gentleman from Texas asked as to what results could be expected from this experiment, and quoted the answer given.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA: On page 33, line 4, strike out "\$39,113," and insert in lieu thereof "\$39,112.50."

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, this is a bona fide amendment and quite in keeping with the discussion that has been going on for the last 15 minutes. I am glad that I am in a position where I do not have to follow any leader in this House, whether he makes a sensible amendment or an inane discussion. At least I am in a position to talk freely and strike regardless of where the chips may fall.

The opposition to the appropriation for Howard University on the Democratic side yesterday was as unjustified as the attack on this particular appropriation in this instance by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is to-day. In both instances "there was a colored gentleman in the woodpile." [Laughter.] Yesterday it was a great many of them, fine young Americans attending Howard University, and to-day petty partisan politics. Why, Mr. Chairman, science knows no politics. Are we in this frenzy of economy, brought about by those who control the wealth of this country, seeking to put a barrier on science and research for the paltry sum of \$39,113 out of an appropriation of \$100,000,000? Science

will go on when existing political parties will long have been forgotten.

I am sorry that the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in the House states that he is not versed in botany and publicly admits that he does not know anything of these terms or what it is all about; but, Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a sad day for the people of this country when we must close the doors of the laboratories doing research work for the people of the United States. The gentleman from New York says it is all foolish.

Yes; it was foolish when Burbank was experimenting with wild cactus. It was foolish when the Wright boys went down to Kitty Hawk and had a contraption there that they were going to fly like birds. It was foolish when Robert Fulton tried to put a boiler into a sailboat and steam it up the Hudson. It was foolish when one of my ancestors thought the world was round and discovered this country so that the gentleman from New York could become a Congressman. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, we are going just a little bit too far on this question of economy. I will tell you where the economy should start, Mr. Chairman, and I am going to harp upon this question in the few remaining days of my legislative life in this session. That is start right now in cutting down the debt service; start right now in cutting down the interest charges; start right now in giving some relief to the American people, but do not seek to stop progress; do not seek to put the hand of politics on these scientific men who are doing a great work. As the gentleman from Texas points out, it is not the discharge of these particular employees that is at stake, it is all of the work of investigation, of research, of experimentation that has been going on for years that will be stopped and lost. Science, of course, is for the benefit and the happiness of the people. The trouble is that the benefits of science, the benefits of progress have been and are now controlled as everything else is controlled in this country by a small minority. We are seeking to give all of the people the benefit of the scientific research provided for in this bill.

Perhaps the gentleman from New York wants to take these research laboratories and put them into the hands of some private corporation and then secure a patent upon some new plants, as we provided a few Congresses ago, so they could have a monopoly upon even any development that may be made out of these researches. Here is the one hope of the American people of having at least a public scientific laboratory to continue the research in competition with private research that is going on so that the people of this country may have the benefit of this very useful work.

I want to follow my leader, of course, and I offer this amendment that we may say we have saved 50 cents on this agricultural bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cereal crops and diseases: For the investigation and improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of cereal production and for the study and control of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broomcorn and methods of broomcorn production, \$488,200.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 33, line 11, strike out "\$488,200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$465,915."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to eliminate \$22,285 from the corn-borer appropriation. There are six corn-borer items carried in this bill. During the past few years the Federal Government has expended on the European corn borer about \$20,000,000.

The testimony before our committee year after year is to the effect that the corn borer has been in this country 25

years; that it constantly spreads; that it can not be destroyed; that its spread can not be prevented; and that it has caused but little damage.

The Department of Agriculture has demonstrated that it can be controlled, if at any time it really becomes destructive in a certain type of low and wet land, simply by cleaning up the cornstalks, by raking them up and burning them or by turning them under the soil. This is very effective and so simple it can be carried out on any farm. Why waste the people's money?

This appropriation has gone on from year to year over my protest. Two years ago, over my protest, you appropriated \$1,401,560. Last year you appropriated \$661,374, and this bill carries \$319,653, all for the suppression, the control, the investigation, the study of the habits of the corn borer, the devising of machinery for its eradication, and the devising of something to grow in the place of corn in the event the corn borer should become destructive. Such lavish expenditures are not justified by the facts, and I am opposed to this waste of public funds.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman is a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture. Why did he not offer this amendment in the subcommittee or in the full committee?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. As the gentleman knows, I discussed this in the full committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I did not offer an amendment. The chairman of the subcommittee, for whom I have the greatest respect and with whom I have worked in great harmony, suggested that this matter might well be discussed on the floor. This is not a matter in which I am personally interested. I am well acquainted with the Corn Belt. I lived in that section many years. I have many friends and relatives there engaged in corn growing. I am viewing this from the testimony that has been presented by the scientific men of the Department of Agriculture before our committee year after year. I believe this appropriation is a waste of the taxpayers' money. I am offering the amendment to give the Members an opportunity of eliminating this amount as one of the six corn-borer appropriations that are carried in the bill. I think that four of them might very well be eliminated at this time, making a saving of \$100,000.

As I stated before, you have expended about \$20,000,000 on the corn borer. The yellow press has alarmed the country, and yet it does not do as much damage as the grub-worm, as the cutworm, as the grasshopper, as the Mormon cricket, the cabbage worm or potato bug, or any one of scores of other pests that we practically ignore. All of them are more destructive to their respective crops than is the corn borer. I ask that you support this amendment so that we may eliminate this expense. The corn borer is only a boggy worm. We have innumerable destructive pests, but the European corn borer is not in that category. Do not waste the taxpayers' money.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I will say to my colleagues that I am placed in a rather peculiar situation. Time and again I have to get up on the floor of the House and defend appropriations during this period to be spent for purposes far, far from my section of our common country.

As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] has said, we have spent at least \$20,000,000, and now this Budget estimate came up to us, and my committee has reduced this item for the corn borer alone \$247,000, leaving \$319,000. In other words, we have cut the amount which the Budget estimated was necessary nearly in half. We have left a few items of the appropriation. Thirteen thousand nine hundred and sixty-eight dollars, an item at which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] is aiming, is for the development of cultural methods in the corn-borer-infested area and to find a variety of corn that is resistant

to the corn borer and for work of that sort. This item was \$30,000 year before last, it was \$25,000 last year, and now we have cut it to \$15,000. In other words, I want the Plant Bureau to finish the experiments that they now have on hand and wind them up, and this reduction is notice to them to wind up such experiments.

I do not feel like taking the responsibility and assuming to myself wisdom sufficient to say that this corn borer is not going to be destructive of the corn crop of the United States. I do not know. In some countries it has destroyed from 10 to 20 per cent of the crop. In other countries it is not that bad, and this seems to be the condition in our country, and I hope it is the condition.

I am not willing to say that we will have no further investigations in order to keep up with the history of this bug until we determine it is not commercially damaging the corn crop. The corn crop is too big an investment for the agricultural people of this country to risk a few hundred thousand dollars of appropriations.

As I have already stated there is \$8,000 for the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils to try to find a poison for the corn borer so they can poison it wherever it now does some commercial damage in the sweet-corn areas.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I have no intention of offering an amendment for the elimination of that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not know what the gentleman has in mind. We made a recommendation of \$210,000 for the Bureau of Entomology for biological research to bring parasites here to destroy the corn borer and to recolonize those that they have already brought here wherever they can be recolonized.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I may say for the gentleman's information that the first two items and the last two items are the ones to which I am directing my amendments.

Mr. BUCHANAN. One of the items is for the Bureau of Plant Quarantine, \$40,000. My recollection is the Bureau of the Budget recommended \$211,900. We cut this down to \$40,000.

What can the Bureau of Plant Quarantine do with this amount of money? Under the authority of this bill they can continue a system of inspection of products raised in the infested area and those products can be shipped to other States under Federal certificate. As it stands now, there are 13 States infested with the corn borer, and every State around the 13 States has issued a quarantine against the infested area. The people who have to ship products in interstate commerce in this infested area ought to have some rights. They can devote this \$40,000 either to this work or to scouting, whichever is the most valuable. In my judgment, scouting will serve no purpose except to keep up the progress of the corn borer.

Individually, as a problem far removed from my home and my section of the country, I think the appropriations ought to be made and that this bug ought to be kept up with, so that if it should develop as a serious menace in new corn areas we can check it and fight it and control it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, continuing with the reading of the bill, read to page 34, line 10.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. BANKHEAD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MONTAGUE,

Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13872, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, and had come to no resolution thereon.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE LAW LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. John T. Vance, librarian of the Law Library of Congress, on the Centennial of the Law Library of Congress. It is a well-written article and one that will be useful to every Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE LAW LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—ENVELOPED IN AN ATMOSPHERE OF TRADITION, WHICH ADDS A LUSTER TO ITS BIBLIOGRAPHICAL TREASURES, THE LIBRARY IS UNIQUE AMONG SISTER INSTITUTIONS—PLANS FOR CELEBRATING CENTENNIAL BY OPENING EXHIBITION OF SOME OF ITS CHOICEST COLLECTIONS, FOLLOWING DEDICATION OF THE SUPREME COURT BUILDING

By John T. Vance, Law Librarian of Congress

On October 13 of this bicentennial year the corner stone of the Supreme Court's new temple will be laid in the presence of that illustrious body and the American Bar Association with a ceremony befitting the year, the institution, and the cause it will serve.

The Supreme Court, like the American ambassador to London until recent years, has had no home. Content to accept the modest quarters provided by the Congress or occasioned by the ravages of warfare and fire, the court has had no less than 15 temporary residences, once having dispensed justice in a tavern.

It was in 1812 that the Justices were given the privilege of using the Library of Congress,¹ which, according to Chief Justice Marshall, was considered a great favor.² The law department of the Library from its beginning has been a true *amicus curiæ*, as attested by the Federal statutes and the rules of the court, and it will continue to render the same loyal service when the court occupies the new building. The proximity of the library to the court has given rise to the impression, still current even among some members of the Supreme Court bar, that it is the law library of the Supreme Court, but the statutes are to the contrary notwithstanding.³ Occupying the old Supreme Court chamber directly beneath the present chamber of the court, and located just across the central corridor from the famous conference room of the court, the law library of Congress is enveloped in an atmosphere of tradition,⁴ which adds a luster to its bibliographical treasures, making it unique among sister institutions.

The law library having turned the century mark on July 14, it is planned to celebrate that anniversary by opening in the main building of the Library of Congress an exhibition of some of its choicest and most interesting collections just following the dedication of the Supreme Court Building. Perhaps a brief history of the law library of Congress and an account of some of its activities and aims would be of interest to the members of the American Bar Association who will attend the convention.

The Library of Congress was founded in 1800, and \$5,000 was appropriated for the purchase of books.⁵ Being housed in the Capitol, it was almost totally destroyed by the British in 1814 when it numbered only 3,000 volumes. It is not known how many of the volumes burned were law books, but as Thomas Jefferson was ardently interested in the Library from its beginning, it is safe to assume that it was not lacking in such material. Jefferson's own library of not quite 7,000 volumes, which Congress purchased after the destruction of its Library, was notably strong in "law and politics," as he expressed it in a letter to the librarian.

In 1817 the Committee on the Library reported that "the collection of law books now in the Library is as valuable and as complete as it was possible to have expected it to be, considering the time at which the books were purchased."

A number of resolutions were presented in Congress during the first 30 years of the nineteenth century, directing the Library Committee to inquire into the expediency of separating the law books from the general library, and placing them under the Supreme Court, all of which failed to pass. It remained for Congressman Charles H. Wickliffe, of Kentucky, to convince Congress

of the need for establishing a law library, and on July 14, 1832, an act was passed entitled "An act to increase and improve the law department of the Library of Congress." The act provides in Paragraph I:

"That it shall be the duty of the librarian to prepare an apartment near to and connected by an easy communication with that in which the Library of Congress is now kept for the purpose of a law library; to remove the law books now in the Library into such apartment; and to take charge of the law library in the same manner as he is now required to do of the Library of Congress."

It was further enacted that the Justices of the Supreme Court should have free access to the law library, and they were authorized to make such rules and regulations for the use of the same by themselves and the attorneys and counselors during the sittings of the court as they should deem proper, although a proviso was added that such rules and regulations should not restrict the President of the United States, the Vice President, or any Member of the Senate or House of Representatives from having access to the law library or using the books therein in the same manner that he then had or might have had to use the books of the Library of Congress.

A room north of the main library in the Capitol was fitted up for the use of the law library, and there it remained until 1843, when it was removed to an apartment on the west side of the basement on the north wing of the Capitol near the Supreme Court room. The Supreme Court having moved to its present quarters after the Senate had abandoned them in 1859, the chamber vacated by the court was assigned for the use of the law library.

While Congress has guarded jealously its absolute title in the law library, it can not be gainsaid that the Supreme Court has been granted preferential treatment with reference to its use. Early in its history, Congress gave the Chief Justice supervision over the purchase of law books, it being provided that they should be purchased under the direction of the Chief Justice, which provision persists even to the current appropriation act, although this practice, like presiding on the circuit, has long since fallen into disuse.

Despite small annual appropriations and a fire in 1851,⁶ the law library grew from a collection of 2,011 volumes (639 of which belonged to the Jefferson collection) in 1832, until at the close of the Civil War it was considered the best and largest collection of law books in America.⁷

Since 1870, when the office of register of copyrights was established and placed under the Librarian of Congress, the increase of the law library in modern material through the deposit of copyrighted books has been quickened. Another important factor in the development of the law library has been through international exchange, whereby the Library of Congress, by virtue of the Brussels conventions of 1886 (which the United States Government signed), and by virtue of separate agreements with non-signatory powers, exchanges the official documents of our Government, including Federal laws, in return for the laws and other publications of 69 foreign countries, dominions, and colonies.

The collections of the law library now number a total of approximately 270,000 volumes. At the immediate service of Congress and the Supreme Court are several libraries located at the Capitol. In the hallowed chamber where the Supreme Court sat from 1815 to 1859 there is only space for 40,000 volumes, and it is therefore limited to a working library of Anglo-American law. The conference-room library, consisting almost entirely of court reports, is as nearly a sanctum sanctorum as any law library could be—for the Justices alone may use it, and they alone may be present during conference hours.

Another collection of the law library is known as the "judges' sets," and, numbering about 6,500 volumes, is distributed among the Justices in their private studies.

The main body of the law library is located in various parts of the Library of Congress Building. Here are more than 200,000 volumes of purely legal material, including several duplicates of most of the books at the Capitol, for the law library is a circulating library and from three to five sets of the American court reports, session laws, and statutes have to be maintained for the use of Congress and the courts. All of the American colonial law, the early English statutes, yearbooks and treatises, and the other rare imprints are in this building. Here are the records and briefs of the Supreme Court, all foreign collections, British colonial, Roman, ancient, medieval, canon, and other special classes of law and jurisprudence. The international law, public and private, the constitutional and administrative law collections are also located in the main building and classified under the Library of Congress scheme of classification as subdivisions of political science. These important collections and many others—volumes on many special subjects of the social sciences, for example, marriage and divorce, finance, railroads, education, etc., of which it is estimated that there are more than 50,000 volumes, are classified and shelved throughout the general department of the Library.

Thus, under the distinguished and able direction of the present Librarian of Congress, Dr. Herbert Putnam, who has guided its destiny for more than 33 years, the law library has developed to such an extent that it will compare favorably with the best law

¹ United States Statutes at Large, vol. 2, p. 786.

² The Chief Justice wrote a letter of acknowledgment to the House of Representatives (Annals 23, 1116).

³ United States Code, title 2, sec. 132.

⁴ "There could hardly be found a spot in the United States about which has happened so much having to do with the history of our Federal Government" (Williamson, The Law Library in the Capitol, Washington, 1929, p. 1). Every member of the Supreme Court bar visiting this chamber will be interested in seeing the bas-relief of justice, which is engraved on his certificate of admission to the court.

⁵ United States Statutes at Large, vol. 2, p. 56.

⁶ United States Statutes at Large, vol. 4, p. 579; United States Code, title 2, sec. 137.

⁷ Johnson's History of the Library, p. 251.

⁸ Catalogues of the collection were published in 1839 in 98 pages, in 1849 in 139 pages, and in 1860 in 225 pages.

libraries in the country. As a working law library it is perhaps the equal of any, because of its proximity to the great reference collections of the main library. It should be unique for several reasons. In the first place, the American Nation holds undisputed leadership among the nations of the world, and as the indispensable tool of the Government at its principal seat, the law library must be preeminent, not only in Americana but in all foreign legal literature. The prestige of the United States in the fields of diplomacy and commerce may well depend upon our knowledge of the laws of the other countries and their interpretation.

The administration of criminal justice in the United States was denounced as a disgrace by a former President (later Chief Justice) a quarter of a century ago. Despite perennial criticism and a multiplicity of investigations and reports thereon it continues to be the most important single question in American life. Sooner or later this problem must be solved in the light of modern scientific methods. In the meantime the most complete library available of the systems of the world must be gathered into one repository. What more logical or useful place could be found for it than the national law library?

In urging the Committee on Appropriations in 1930 to increase the small appropriation for the purchase of books for the law library Justice Harlan Fiske Stone said: "You have here in Washington greater demand for a law library than in any other place. You have the Supreme Court and the courts of the District; you have both House of Congress; you have the Diplomatic Service. These call for constant, practical use of the law library. Therefore, you ought to build it up for them. * * * I see increasingly coming to this city various organizations created for the purposes of legal scholarship and research [citing the American Law Institute and others]. They are typical of many other institutions which will come to Washington in the future which will require a really great law library. * * * There are other fields of historical, social, and economic research which are not primarily legal at all, and yet have sooner or later to do with the law, because all the problems of past history, of social and economic significance, ultimately find expression in the law in some form or other. So I am very anxious to see Congress take hold of this thing with the definite idea of building up a great collection which will be of service to men interested in the law and to scholars for all time."¹⁰

Such is the national law library of the future as visualized by Justice Stone, who sees its needs from the standpoint of a great lawyer, a great law-school dean, and a great judge. In the realization of this worthy ambition the law library will require not only the support of Congress in the matter of appropriations but also the cooperation and patronage of the American bench and bar. Being a Government institution, the law library has had to depend entirely upon the small appropriations and the accessions produced through copyright and exchange. Lawyers are proverbially utilitarian in the matter of collecting law books, and if they happen to gather rich collections of rarities, they usually leave them to their bar associations or law-school libraries. They consider that the Government should provide for its own library out of taxes, which is not to be denied. That very status, however, has deprived the law library of Congress of the acquisition of the rarer types of legal imprints, foreign-law collections, and the development of research apparatus, which a philanthropic alumnus or citizen such as John W. Sterling, W. W. Cook, or Hampton Carson would have intrusted to their law-school *almae matres* or their local libraries.

The law library has undoubtedly the most distinguished clientele among the bench and bar of the United States, but it has no cohesive society of friends and patrons to bespeak for it the *desiderata* and research facilities needed in order to answer the ever-growing demands made upon it.

Here is a cause which should have a strong appeal to the American Bar Association. What society could more appropriately sponsor the national law library than the National Bar Association? The authorization for patriotic assistance has been granted by Congress in the Library of Congress trust fund act.¹¹ Since that enabling act whereby the trust fund board is authorized to accept, hold, and administer gifts or bequests of personal property for the benefit of the Library, its collections or its services, as might be approved by the board and Joint Committee on the Library, more than \$1,000,000 has been given to the Library of Congress for various projects, looking to an expansion of its bibliographical apparatus, the creation and maintenance of interpretative positions, such as consultants in special fields and even for the endowment of chairs, the occupants of which combine the interpretative with the administrative function. However, the vast field of the law—the very vein of the Library—has not had the good fortune to share in any of these gifts or bequests.

If, as has been said, "The history of the United States has been written not merely in the Halls of Congress, in the executive offices, and on the battlefields, but to a great extent in the chambers of

the Supreme Court of the United States,"¹² the law library in rounding out a century of service can claim to have played a part, humble though it may be, in those pages penned in the Halls of Congress and in the chambers of the Supreme Court. It requires no stretch of the imagination to picture Marshall, Story, Webster, Calhoun, Clay, Lincoln, and all the other great statesmen of the Nation within a century poring over the volumes in the law library in preparation for an argument before the Supreme Court or a debate in Congress. Where is there another law library that can boast of a similar record of service or wealth of tradition?

Such a history merits an appropriate memorial—a gift of a notable collection of books perhaps, or the endowment of a chair of jurisprudence. Here is a challenge to the friends of the law library of Congress.

DEATH OF EX-REPRESENTATIVE SPROUL, OF KANSAS

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes to announce the death of my predecessor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to the House the death of my predecessor, the Hon. William H. Sproul, who served in this House for eight years, beginning March 4, 1923.

During that time he served his district and his country with fidelity. By his own choice he did not stand for reelection for a seat in this House. Doubtless he could have been returned to Congress as long as he chose.

Again I say it is with deep regret I bring the sad information to the House of the untimely death of the Hon. William H. Sproul.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BEEDY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. NELSON of Missouri (at the request of Mr. ROMJUE), indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. CARY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for Mrs. WINGO, indefinitely, on account of the serious illness of her son.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXPANSION OF CURRENCY

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein extracts of letters received by me to-day.

Mr. SCHAFER. Reserving the right to object, what public question is involved in the letters?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. It is on the inflation of the currency.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in to-day's mail I received a letter from Mr. W. P. Henry, of 144-177 Barclay Avenue, Flushing, Long Island, N. Y., in which Mr. Henry, after referring to my remarks of the 19th of this month on the subject of dangerous quack remedies, said:

Now, suppose you amend the bill you discussed in your speech as published in the RECORD so that 2 per cent in stamps would be required every four months, whether the certificate had been traded or not—6 per cent per annum—the "rich man," the banker, would not hoard it; if he did, he would pay the Government 6 per cent per annum for holding it out of circulation, and at the end of 16½ years the Government would have in the Treasury from the sale of stamps 100 cents on the dollar on each certificate redeemable in 1950, and the certificate would be par anywhere, and current everywhere that a silver dollar is current. Most of the certificates would pass fifty times in less than one year, and would then become as good currency as any other, and interchangeable at the Treasury or anywhere else for any other currency.

I have favored the payment of the soldiers' bonus if that could be done without hazarding the national credit. I believe that 90 per cent of the people feel that way about it. We need the inflation that the three billion two hundred million of such currency would give, and the bankers tell us that no other plan, of all that have been suggested, would be safe.

¹² The Supreme Court in United States History, by Charles Warren, Boston, 1923, vol. 1, p. 1.

¹⁰ The Soviet Government has established several institutes for the study of crime and criminology which have published substantial contributions on this subject. See publications of Moskovskii Kabinet po izucheniu lichnosti prestupnika, and of Gosudarstvennyi Institut po izucheniu prestupnosti i prestupnika.

¹¹ Hearings before subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations. 71st Cong., 2d sess. Washington, 1930, p. 233.

¹² United States Code, title 2, secs. 154-163.

There would be numberless suggested amendments to any bill you may draw on this subject, one of which would provide that in addition to the payment of the bonus, salaries of Congressmen, Senators, and all who receive Government pay, from the President down to fourth-class postmaster, contractors, and others, should be paid in the same way—for a term of years. Even that would work no great hardship on any, and would guarantee a circulating medium that would be proof against the banketeers' hoarding and protect the poor man—the public; lift prices—cotton to 10 cents, wheat to \$1, and other products above the cost of production.

The real advantage would be threefold: A guaranty against hoarding, the revival of trade that such a large volume of such currency would stimulate, and automatically liquidate itself.

Mr. Speaker, as a whole this is the very best suggestion I have yet heard along the line of certificates to circulate as currency and automatically provide a means or a tax for their own self-liquidation. I would, though, amend this plan so that the stamps be required only every four months or only every year regardless of how often the money is used.

It will be remembered that I directed my darts principally at the new method of imposing a 2 per cent sales tax on every transfer of money, as suggested in most of the proposals. Mr. Henry's suggestion, as I would amend it, is as far from the sales-tax plan vigorously advocated by some as the East is from the West. If used at all, I suggest what amounts to an annual 6 per cent tax on the ownership of this kind of money. In no sense do I advocate the absurd, ridiculous sales tax advocated by some on every transaction wherein these certificates are involved. Under Mr. Henry's plan, as amended, more than 16 years would be permitted in which to liquidate these certificates. The plan I was criticizing probably would force this entire amount to be raised out of the average class of people in much less than one year if a speeded-up circulation took place.

For instance, under the plan I was criticizing the whole amount of a certificate would be raised by taxes when it changed hands fifty times, be that in a month, a week, or even a day. The plan I was criticizing puts the tax or penalty on the use of the money and would retard its circulation—the very thing we so much need. Mr. Henry's plan, if properly amended, puts no burden on the circulation and would not at all increase the hoarding evil. This plan is better in every respect than the one to which I am so much opposed. In fact, I would like to see a tax imposed on money which is unnecessarily held in hoarding.

I feel, though, that there is serious danger in the Federal Government invading too many new fields of taxation. I want every tax reservoir possible left to the State and at least for this reason am not in position to indorse Mr. Henry's plan for Federal purposes. I would rather indorse his plan for the purpose of paying the balance of adjusted compensation due the World War veterans or for farm relief purposes or to aid unemployment or for aid to the freezing, starving millions, than for any other purpose. In fact, I would support Mr. Henry's plan with an amendment for the purposes just enumerated, if there was no other way to raise the money necessary for these purposes; but I believe there are ample other available much better methods. I certainly do not favor any method of raising money solely and only for the purpose of indiscriminately giving it away to everybody, the very rich included, whether they need it or not.

I respectfully urge that any of these plans work better when confined to a State or municipality than on a nationwide scale. A small city or town may very properly impose any legal tax it may see proper for its own use. This, though, does not at all justify the invasion of the States and their subdivisions by Federal taxing and police authorities for any such purpose. Of course, the certificates I am now discussing must not be confused with script or certificates sometimes very properly issued and used as a circulating medium by cities, and even banking groups, and which script is not at all to be paid by any such tax scheme but by moneys to be raised by other and entirely different methods. I know how much need there is for an expansion of the currency and how strong the urge is for some means of putting more—yes, much more—money in active circulation, but I believe this can be safely done by the monetization of

farm realty as urged by me on yesterday. By the way, after I completed my remarks on this subject on yesterday I noticed that Dr. J. P. Morton, financial writer of Suffield, Conn., at the opening session of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Atlantic City, on yesterday advocated the adoption of electrical energy as a basis for the issuance of currency by the Government. Also yesterday afternoon papers carried the information from London that J. F. Darling, a director of the Midland Bank, one of England's important financial institutions, was advocating the use of wheat as the basis of money. In discussing the matter, Mr. Darling said:

Wheat has, in a marked degree, one of the qualities of currency basis in that it is in universal demand and has a world-wide market.

Mention was made that in the days of Abraham wheat was used as a medium of exchange and the suggestion was made that therefore currency based on wheat could properly be used now.

Our forefathers used tobacco, cotton, and corn as a medium of exchange. Our people now, deprived of a sufficient medium of exchange, are bartering their products. Is not the real solution of the present crisis to be found in a proper broadening of the base of our currency. Gold only is used now. The remonetization of silver is strongly advocated. All the known gold in the world can be hauled by one freight train or carried in one vessel across the ocean. Is this a sufficient base for the money of the world? Is not gold too easily cornered and do not the bank sharks, with gold as the only base, have complete control of our currency enabling them to destroy our people just when they wish to sacrifice them for the big bankers' own selfish interest? Much of the present value of gold is due to its use as the basis of currency. Why not give this additional value to farm products such as wheat?

If wheat, why not other farm products and why not the farm land itself be monetized? The people of this country could very well get along without any currency payable or redeemable in gold if they had a sufficiency of money payable in food, clothing, shelter, fuel, and other necessities in life and acceptable in the payment of their taxes and other obligations. Will not our real financial problems be largely solved if we will, within reasonable and safe limits, broaden the base of our currency? I most certainly think so.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I wish to submit extracts from an interoffice memorandum prepared by Mr. Louis C. Cramton, special attorney to the Secretary of the Interior, with special reference to the functions of the General Land Office.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit extracts from an interoffice memorandum prepared by Mr. Louis C. Cramton, special attorney to the Secretary of the Interior, concerning the history and proper functions of the Department of the Interior, with special reference to the functions of the General Land Office. This information is of special interest at this time, when the Congress is considering the recommendations of the President as contained in his recent message to Congress to transfer to the Department of Agriculture the General Land Office, which for over three-quarters of a century has been in the Department of the Interior.

The extracts are as follows:

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—ITS HISTORY AND PROPER FUNCTIONS

By Louis C. Cramton, special attorney to the Secretary

Functions of the Department of the Interior: The Department of the Interior is not an accidental assemblage of unrelated activities, as is the impression of many.

It is a logical bringing together, through its more than 80 years of existence, of several governmental activities, generally closely

interrelated, and all coming within the definite scope of the important central functions of the department—the internal development of the Nation, with reference both to men and to things.

An outstanding phase of that development has been, and is, the most beneficial utilization of the public domain from the standpoint of settler and of Nation. In the very nature of things the to-be-developed public domain is always the least populated section of the country, and hence the least known, its problems the least understood. Hence it is that the Interior Department is possibly the least understood of all the departments of the Federal governmental organization, its problems the least understood or appreciated by the bulk of the Nation's population, and even of the Nation's legislators and its press. The fact that the region is the least known and least populated does not lessen the importance to the Nation of the proper solution of its problems, affecting so greatly the future of the Nation. It does, on the contrary, demonstrate the necessity for an understanding agency for the administration of the public domain and thereby justifies the continued existence of the Department of the Interior.

But the prominence of the public domain in the operations of the Department of the Interior should not be permitted to obscure the fact that those problems are themselves subordinate details of the central function of the Department of the Interior—the internal development of the Nation, with reference to men and to things.

The dismemberment and destruction of the Department of the Interior would immediately and directly place a tremendous handicap upon the further development of the public-land States and would indirectly therefore be a most serious loss to the Nation. The conservation and beneficial use of water in the desert regions, the prospecting for, and the development and conservation of mineral resources, a multitude of difficult technical problems—all these require even more than ever before that the administration of the public domain be under sympathetic and understanding department leadership.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

This department, created upon the recommendation of a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury in the closing days of the Democratic Polk administration, passed by the House, in which the Whigs had a majority, and a Senate in which the Democrats had a majority, came into operation in the beginning of the Whig administration of Zachary Taylor. The first Secretary of the Interior was the Hon. Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, who was from a public-land State and had had a broad experience in public affairs. He had previously served as United States Senator for six years and as Secretary of the Treasury under President Harrison. He served as Secretary of the Interior from March 8, 1849, to July 23, 1850, when he resigned to accept an appointment in the United States Senate.

The wisdom of the establishment of the Department of the Interior with a view to fuller consideration of important problems of internal development was well illustrated in the first report of Secretary Ewing, under date of December 3, 1849. The various problems affecting the public domain, as well as the Patent Office, the Pension Office, and the Indian Bureau, are therein brought to the attention of the Congress directly from the standpoint of their relationship to national development.

It appears from this that for over 80 years, since the establishment of the Department of the Interior in 1849, the Secretary of the Interior has been the special guardian and the most qualified spokesman for the important special problems of the public-land States in the executive councils of the Nation. He has uniformly worked in behalf of the proper solution of these problems with an active and able representation in House and Senate from these States—a representation vastly in the minority.

This leadership of the Department of the Interior in the development of the public domain has been so sympathetic and so understanding that Congress has long since abandoned treatment of the public domain as a source of financial revenue and has given liberal consideration to the adoption of policies having development and general welfare as chief objectives rather than revenue. Homestead laws, the reclamation law, the general code of mining laws, are all illustrative of this. Without a Department of the Interior, the history of the progress of the Nation for the past 80 years would have been much different. The Department of the Interior has carried forward the frontiers and sponsored the welfare of the pioneer and the settler.

I have said that these problems of the public domain have always most directly concerned the public-land States. This was true in the days of Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi; Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois; and Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, who came from what were then important public-land States. It is true to-day, when Mississippi, Illinois, and Ohio have long since ceased to be public-land States, and when their people no longer have a personal understanding of problems of the public domain. But what is directly the concern of the public-land States is indirectly the concern of the Nation.

The frontiers have reached the Pacific, the pioneers are few, but the problems of the public domain still are many and important. Land ready for the plow is no longer available, and farmers

are not asking for this land, but a multitude of new problems of importance surround the conservation, the wisest disposition and development of what remains. The conservation and beneficial use of water in the desert regions, the prospecting for and the development and conservation of mineral resources, and a multitude of other difficult technical problems—all these require even more than ever before that the administration of the public domain be under sympathetic and understanding department leadership.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR TO-DAY

The Department of the Interior to-day consists of the following bureaus and agencies whose activities have to do with our internal development and welfare and logically are associated together in the same department.

The General Land Office: When the department was created, the disposal of the public lands had been treated as an important source of public revenue. As was made clear in the debates I have heretofore quoted, it was the desire of the public land States and the purpose of the Congress to thereafter follow a new policy looking to the welfare of the pioneer and the settler and the development of the Nation rather than to Federal revenues.

The remaining public lands subject to all applicable public land laws are 173,318,246 acres in the United States proper. There are other public lands subject to administration of the General Land Office under limiting conditions which bring the total area in the United States up to 399,047,884.02 acres as is shown below:

Vacant lands subject to all applicable public land laws	Acres
National forest land subject to all mining laws and possible homestead entry	173,318,246.00
Stock-raising homesteads, all minerals reserved	133,800,000.00
All minerals reserved in patents under various acts other than stock-raising homestead law	23,440,896.40
Coal reserved	104,472.14
Oil, gas, phosphate, or other named mineral reserved	10,727,659.32
Stock-driveway withdrawals subject to the mining laws	1,629,529.16
Existing unperfected entries, etc.	9,535,955.00
Producing oil and gas fields	24,164,842.00
Carey Act withdrawals	843,106.00
Power site reserves	925,830.00
Public water reservations	5,005,242.00
Reservoir sites	437,249.00
Miscellaneous reserves	254,010.00
Reclamation withdrawals	1,460,847.00
	13,400,000.00
	399,047,884.02
Alaska	378,165,760.00
Grand total	777,213,644.02

So far as the land is concerned, there is practically none of it that is truly farming land. A little of it, when reclaimed by drainage or irrigation, or both, presents real farming possibilities. But this, if it is to have value for cultivation, it must come through the construction of engineering works for the conservation and distribution of water, and the percentage that can be so reclaimed is very small. Some of it presents stock-raising possibilities. Some of it has forest possibilities, but in the main such lands have already been set aside (in national forests), for administration by the Forest Service. The remaining public domain in the United States, more than nine-tenths of it, presents no agricultural problem.

The greatest value in our remaining public domain lies in its mineral resources and water resources.

Seventy per cent of the vacant public land is of desert or semi-desert class, lying within the line of 11-inch rainfall. Much of the remainder is mountainous and rough land.

Perhaps the major public-land problem to-day, the one that affects most the people as a whole, is in the withdrawals made for conserving and controlling water and water power, for stock driveways, reclamation and irrigation, and similar utilitarian purposes. The net acres of such withdrawals in Government ownership have been estimated at 26,000,000. In the attempt to handle to the best advantage the vast estate of the public domain there was withdrawn or restored last year over 9,000,000 acres. The public-land problem is to-day one of general economics in which geology and engineering play a large part.

The character of lands now being disposed of is shown by the following table covering the last fiscal year and will emphasize what I have just said. While this table shows nearly half a million acres of so-called plow land, it is probable that not one-fifth of that amount will ever actually come under plow. It will be noted that three-fourths of the whole area disposed of during the year went in grazing lands in 640-acre homesteads. It is safe to say that of this area not one-fifth of it is land with sufficient grazing productivity to enable a man to make a living on a 640-acre homestead. These will actually be used to round out and supplement other areas of privately owned land, and in this manner the present public land will pass.

Original public-land entries for 1932 (ceded Indian lands included)

Agricultural (so-called plow) class	Number	Acres
160-acre and 320-acre homesteads and forest (160-acre) homesteads.	3,583	493,922
Irrigation class, reclamation homesteads (160 acres maximum) and desert entries (320 acres maximum)	243	26,853
	3,826	520,775
Grazing class (no cultivation required), 640-acre stock-raising homesteads	7,305	3,544,677
Other classes (no cultivation required):		
State	806	412,084
Miscellaneous	616	132,404
	1,422	544,488
	12,553	4,609,940

The General Land Office has in charge the administration of this vast domain. It has the responsibility of surveying these lands as a necessary preliminary to any appropriation, lease, or disposal. It has the responsibility of protecting them from trespass and from unauthorized appropriation.

If it is proposed to reclaim these lands, through construction of engineering works, for the conservation and distribution of water, it has as its neighbor in the Department of the Interior the Bureau of Reclamation, which for 30 years has carried on the construction of such engineering works and the administration of the interests of the Government in development thereunder. In this connection it may be noted as typical of the close relation of these two bureaus that the disposal of lands reclaimed under Federal reclamation projects is through the homestead law, administered by the General Land Office, and the withdrawal of lands for construction purposes and reclamation is made by the Secretary upon the recommendation of the Reclamation Service, governed by the records of the General Land Office.

In the investigation, development, and administration of the mineral resources of this public domain it has as its neighbor in the Department of the Interior the Geological Survey. The law places upon this neighbor the responsibility for the classification of the public lands as mineral or nonmineral, coal or non-coal, timber or nontimber, as well as their designation for entry under the enlarged and the stock-raising homestead laws, etc. It also has the responsibility of the study of water resources and the study of power resources, the latter with particular attention to the power resources of the public lands. The work of these two bureaus in connection with the administration and field operations under the mineral leasing act, such as involve the development of our coal, oil, gas, and other so-called fuel and food minerals, is inseparably coordinated. Due to the intertwining of the mineral interests and the agricultural interests in the same land it is most imperative that the guiding hand and appellate officer for both interests be one, the Secretary of the Interior.

There are now 8,152,056 acres under mineral leases and permits, and most of this acreage is also subject to agricultural entry. There are 52,902,557 acres entered or patented with mineral reservation, and a gross 82,344,529 acres withdrawn or classified for mineral whose net deduction of private lands and duplications can not be determined.

In so far as the public domain touches upon the Indian, the General Land Office has also as its neighbor in the Department of the Interior the Bureau of Indian Affairs. All surveys of Indian lands are made by the General Land Office, and trust and fee patents to original allottees, or to subsequently determined heirs, are issued by it upon the recommendation of the Indian Office. Contests concerning lands on Indian reservations not opened to entry under the homestead laws are decided by the Indian Office. In the case of surplus lands available for homestead entry, such controversies as may arise are settled by the General Land Office; but not infrequently transactions relating to those areas must be handled jointly by the two offices. Contestants in either type of case have the right to appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, where uniformity in decision is maintained in so far as differing conditions and special legislation permit. Furthermore, the vast original records of the General Land Office must constantly be consulted by the Indian Office in connection with the leasing of lands, the partition of heirship lands, and in many other cases. Access could, of course, be secured if in different departments but only with great inconvenience and loss of time and of clerical efficiency.

Another neighbor in the Department of the Interior with which there is cooperation is the National Park Service. The General Land Office cooperates with this service in the surveys necessary for the identification and administration of parks and monuments. It cooperates in the determination and withdrawal of lands available for the enlargement of existing parks and monuments or the creation of new ones. The adjudication of claims adverse to national park purposes, as well as the acquirement of title to privately owned lands needed for park purposes is accomplished with the cooperation of the General Land Office.

In Alaska the vital affairs of Indians, mining, geological and land surveys, railroad operation, and territorial government are so closely allied with the public land that no division of responsibility between two departments is safely possible. The Governor of Alaska, under authority of existing law, has been designated the ex officio commissioner representing the Secretary of the Interior

in all public-land matters in Alaska, and with him there is constant contact.

It has been suggested that the General Land Office be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Since agricultural development of these lands in the main is not to be expected, the work of the General Land Office does not tie into the statutory responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. There is only one bureau in the Department of Agriculture with which the General Land Office has any extensive contacts, that is the Forest Service, but the forest areas of the public domain under the General Land Office are relatively small as compared with the nonforest areas. In 1932 only 4,019 acres were entered under the timber and stone law. The General Land Office has as its major problems subjects with which the Forest Service has only incidental connection. Transfer of the General Land Office from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture would mean taking it away from a department efficiently administering it and in which most of its interbureau relationships are found and transferring it to a department to whose statutory problem it is alien, in which its interbureau relationships generally are not found and which has already reached the limit of growth for most efficient departmental administration.

It is of the greatest importance to understand that as the administrator of the public domain the Secretary of the Interior is the managing, coordinating, and appellate officer for five other bureaus or subjects, closely allied with the General Land Office, viz, the National Park Service, the Indian Office, the Reclamation Service, the Geological Survey, and Alaska.

History has taught us that the right of appeal for the redress of fancied or real wrongs is perhaps the greatest factor contributing to the tranquillity and happiness of a people and nation. The Department of the Interior has an enviable reputation throughout the public-land regions for the ease and fairness with which the humblest public-land claimant can take an appeal and secure a review of his cause. The reviews from or final authorization for the action of the six sections mentioned above are now given their primary consideration by a corps of attorneys in the Secretary's office, thus insuring harmonious action for all the sections or bureaus. It is important that this access to a common court of appeal be not disturbed.

Geological Survey: When the Interior Department was first created, geological surveys and mineral studies of the public domain were carried on to a limited extent by the General Land Office. A little later specific surveys by Hayden under the General Land Office were appropriated for by Congress. In 1897 these activities and others were confided to the Geological Survey. For a few years the activities of the survey were limited to the public domain, but they were soon extended to the entire United States.

The present functions of the Geological Survey include: (a) Classification of public lands into categories recognized by the public land laws, such as mineral or nonmineral, coal or noncoal, timbered or nontimbered, irrigable or nonirrigable, etc.; (b) technical administration of those features of public land laws which depend upon the classification of lands; (c) technical administration of the laws providing for the leasing of minerals in the public lands; (d) studies of the geology and mineral resources of the entire United States, including Alaska; (e) the making of topographic maps of the entire United States, including Alaska and Hawaii; (f) the investigation of the water resources—surface and underground—of the United States, including Alaska and Hawaii; (g) the study of the power resources of the United States, with particular attention to the power resources of the public lands.

Some of these functions very clearly belong exclusively to that department of the Government which is charged with public-land administration. It is equally clear that others fall properly within the department which deals with internal affairs, since all the work of the Geological Survey tends either to establish a foundation for internal development or to yield information needed in connection with the administration of problems that come up with development. Its closest interbureau relations are with the General Land Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the National Park Service, in the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of Mines and Coast and Geodetic Survey, in the Department of Commerce, and the Forest Service and Bureau of Soils, in the Department of Agriculture. Hereinafter will follow some discussion of the functions of the Bureau of Mines, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Soils.

The basic studies carried on by the Geological Survey, in the words of Director Mendenhall, are "used in part in the solution of problems with which a land department must deal and as to the remainder they are used in the solution of problems with which a department of internal affairs can most appropriately deal."

The Bureau of Reclamation: This activity was created under the reclamation act of 1902. For a time it was under the Geological Survey, but for 25 years has existed as a separate organization. The area irrigated with water from Government works is approximately 3,000,000 acres. Originally intended primarily for the development of the public domain, it has in later years aided largely in the development of lands in private ownership. As stated in the current annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, the present policy is very largely "to expend reclamation funds on the rescue of established projects whose water supply is inadequate."

Commissioner Mead gives me this brief statement on the complex character of the work of reclamation administered by his bureau:

"In recent years the relation of reclamation to the development and prosperity of the arid region has become more important and complex. It has to do with the utilization of that region's two primary resources, land and water; and as population increases and the demands for water are multiplied, the importance of its wise diversion and use and the struggle over its control are both augmented. The character of the pioneer irrigation development has contributed to the difficulties which have to be overcome. More lands have been settled and brought under irrigation systems than can be watered from the existing water supply. The result is more costly and frequent shortages, and to overcome this there must be built a large number of reservoirs, which involves larger outlays of money than districts already financially involved can provide and brings in all these other questions not thought of at the outset. Reservoirs make possible the development of hydro-electric power as an adjunct. The profit arising from these power works helps to pay the cost of irrigation, promotes industrial development, and adds to the comforts and convenience of farms; but it brings in water rights of more varied character and makes water laws, the settlement of water rights, and the administration of streams subjects that have to be considered in the determination of what can be wisely undertaken, both for the farmer and for the Government. We have already reached a point where conflicting claims to a single stream stretch along its course for hundreds of miles, and sometimes include diverse interests and laws of two or more States. These relations seem to make it appropriate and desirable that the Reclamation Bureau should continue to be a part of the activity of the Interior Department, which controls the land, studies and keeps records of water supply, and regulates rights to power."

The important interbureau relationships of this bureau are the General Land Office, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior and to a somewhat limited extent the Corps of Engineers of the War Department. It has an even more limited contact with the Agricultural Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture.

If public lands are to be reclaimed through conservation and distribution of water, the Bureau of Reclamation, which constructs the engineering works, must work closely with the General Land Office, which administers the domain. Even when the lands to be irrigated are not entirely from the public domain, the reservoir right of way and the watershed are likely to be of the public domain. The two bureaus are in reality studying our problem, one as the administrator, the other as the engineer.

The contacts with the Geological Survey are very clear, as appears from the above statement concerning that bureau, especially in respect to the studies of water resources and the geological studies involved in the selection of land sites and planning of distribution systems.

In the nature of things cooperation in such cases succeeds in great measure whatever departments are concerned. But the relations of the Indian Bureau with the General Land Office, Bureau of Reclamation, and Geological Survey especially involve extensive cooperation of such a character or under such circumstances that it would be greatly handicapped if these bureaus were not in the same department, and both increased cost and lessened efficiency would result.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 5260. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Marion County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Pearl River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5261. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Tombigbee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 29, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

841. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers, pursuant to the river and harbor act approved July 3, 1930, on preliminary examination and survey of Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn., together with accompanying papers and illustrations; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

842. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers, pursuant to the river and harbor act approved July 3, 1930, on preliminary examination and survey of Egegik River, Alaska, together with accompanying papers and illustration; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

843. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to section 1 of the river and harbor act approved January 21, 1927, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, dated December 22, 1932, submitting a report with accompanying papers and illustrations on Osage River, Mo.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13929) to prevent the scrapping of merchant vessels owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13930) to amend Title IV, section 404, of the merchant marine act, 1928 (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 891h), so as to prevent the Postmaster General from entering into any contract under said section with any citizen operating any foreign-flag ships in competition with any American-flag ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. CROSS: A bill (H. R. 13931) to restore confidence by raising commodity prices through expanding the currency by using silver to broaden the metallic monetary base while preserving the gold standard; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 533) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the State of Wyoming, memorializing Congress in regard to repealing the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDRIGE: A bill (H. R. 13932) granting an increase of pension to Esther J. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13933) granting a pension to Laura Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 13934) for the relief of Frank E. Gilliland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13935) granting a pension to Dora L. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 13936) granting a pension to Julia Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 13937) for the relief of Marion S. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDER: A bill (H. R. 13938) for the relief of Thomas M. A. Quigley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 13939) to grant a patent to Eliza H. Vinson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 13940) for the relief of Henry J. Hollinger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 13941) for the relief of Charles Joseph Whalen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 13942) granting a pension to Twible P. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 13943) to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PITTENGER: A bill (H. R. 13944) granting a pension to Della M. C. Rudolph; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 13945) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 13946) for the relief of O. S. Cordon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13947) for the relief of D. A. Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13948) for the relief of Paul Bulfinch; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13949) granting a pension to Billy George; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13950) for the relief of Robert Rayl; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13951) for the relief of Arvada Noble; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 13952) for the relief of Joseph Shabel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 13953) for the relief of George H. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9245. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted by New York Detachment, No. 1, Marine Corps League, Brooklyn, N. Y., strenuously opposing the attempt on the part of Congress to further reduce the personnel of the United States Marine Corps, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

9246. By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Petition of various citizens of New Bethlehem, Pa., urging the passage of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country, and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9247. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Venus, signed by Ina Home, president, and of the Trinity Evangelical Church of Venus, signed by Rev. N. Frank Boyen, urging the passage of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out the 6,280,000 aliens in this country, and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9248. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the New York Tow Boat Exchange, of New York, urging opposition to any hurried consideration of the proposal to consolidate Government bureaus primarily for the purpose of economy, and also urging a full investigation of the proposals stated based on the actual economics involved as they relate to efficiency; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

9249. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Bronx Board of Trade, favoring an early return of the 2-cent postal rate for first-class letters, and, if impossible, that a 2-cent rate apply to letters intended for local delivery in the city in which they are mailed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9250. By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: Petition of Board of County Commissioners of Bottineau County, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of emergency legislation for the relief of distressed farmers in their county; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9251. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Granite Cutters' International Association of America, Quincy, Mass., protesting against the use of limestone and urging the use of granite for the Federal courthouse for New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9252. Also, petition of the Joint Executive Transportation Committee of Philadelphia Commercial Organizations, approving Senate bill 4491; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

9253. Also, petition of Marine Corps League, New York Detachment, No. 1, Brooklyn, opposing the further reduction of the personnel of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9254. Also, petition of National Federation of Federal Employees, Union No. 384, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the furlough plan and percentage pay cuts of the economy act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9255. Also, petition of National Wool Marketing Corporation, Boston, Mass., urging the continuance of the Federal Farm Board to administer the provisions of the agricultural marketing act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9256. Also, petition of the New York Tow Boat Exchange, 17 Battery Place, New York City, opposing hurried consideration of consolidating governmental bureaus; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

9257. Also, petition of S. Haskel & Sons (Inc.), 97-115 Harrison Place, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the use of granite for the Federal courthouse for New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9258. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Common Council of the City of Buffalo, urging reduction in coal prices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9259. Also, petition of citizens of East Aurora, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution, to count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9260. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of National Wool Marketing Corporation, Boston, Mass., urging that the Federal Farm Board be continued as a body to administer the provisions of the agricultural marketing act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9261. Also, petition of National Granite Commission, Boston, Mass., urging the use of granite for the New York Federal courthouse; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9262. Also, petition of the New York Tow Boat Exchange, New York City, opposing any hurried consideration of the proposal to consolidate Government bureaus; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

9263. Also, petition of the Granite Cutters' International Association of America, Quincy, Mass., urging the use of granite instead of limestone for the new Federal courthouse for New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9264. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of a number of residents of Burgettstown, Pa., supporting the stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9265. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of the Legislature of Mississippi to the Congress, authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to States on the obligations of the States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9266. Also, petition of the Legislature of Mississippi to the Congress, favoring the extending of relief to the owners of homes and farms throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9267. By the SPEAKER: Petition of George A. Carpenter and others, protesting against any beer bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that neither life nor death are able to separate us from the Father's love. As the children of Thy providence we are sheltered in the divine heart, that blessed retreat for all, so tranquil and restful. We breathe our heart's dear love to Thee. Permit us, dear Lord, to approach the tasks of the day with assurance and expectation. Do Thou brood over us and allow us not to wander from the fresh, spiritual, blossoming pastures of the garden life. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.